

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

Baltimore, June, 1900.

"THAN WHOM."

Than whom is usually dismissed with the remark that the construction is syntactically irregular, but is finally accepted usage; and, in testimony, some accessible manual is cited to show that, in certain abridged clauses, the objective is incorrectly employed, though by a tendency so strong as to validate the locution. This, however true, is a very inadequate adjournment of an old, but unsettled, question which deserves minuter consideration.

No one, I believe, except the arbitrary Cobbett and the superior Moon, proposes to put into actual use *than who* instead of *than whom*; though no one explains why he hesitates at the innovation, in the face of the obtrusive analogy for the nominative case. Strange to say, Dean Alford, a volunteer grammarian whose instinct is sometimes better than his reasoning, does observe that this construction cannot be elliptical; but he does not apparently recognize the significance of the observation. Bishop Lowth, too, has a pertinent suggestion; but it is only a suggestion. *Than* by history is undoubtedly a conjunction; and, as such, it can have no effect on the form of any other word. At any rate, no other conjunction—unless, as is sometimes maintained, it be *as*—affects the case of the related pronoun: hence, the dilemma is either to regard *than* as an exception to the usual limited influence of conjunctions or to countenance its migration to that other part of speech, cognate to it as being a connective, but alien to it as showing direct relation between individual words and thus affecting the form of one of them. To put it otherwise, if *than* is not a unique conjunction, must it not be a preposition? That it does become a preposition in this locution is beyond question: how it succeeds to this function remains to be investigated.

Conjunctions, even when they seem to join words and phrases, in reality show only the relations, not between such words and phrases themselves, but between each of them and a third term which is common to them. For ex-

ample, in "John and Mary dance," *and* shows, not what John and Mary have to do with each other—a relation which is not pertinent—but what each of them has to do with *dance*. There are some apparent exceptions to this analysis, but they are only apparent. On the other hand, prepositions join only words, and show what they have to do with each other. For example, in "tons of coal," "killed by poison," *of* and *by* show the relation of the joined words to each other, without reference to any third term, except in so far as all the elements of any group are more or less related to all the other elements. In accordance with this principle, the form of the relative in our phrase must be *whom*, not from any reasons of euphony or usage, still less for any accidental case-confusions of earlier English now licensed; but because the objective case is here inevitable by those established laws of grammar which are elsewhere accepted. It is, of course, admitted that *than* need not, except when immediately followed by the relative, be regarded as a preposition; though there is no reason why it should not be so regarded, when once it has developed the function of case-government; but, with the relative, no other explanation is possible. The real point on which the matter turns has never, if suspected, been disclosed. The explanation of analogy is incompetent, because not cogent: other pronominal forms after *than* vary, historically, between nominative and objective, while *who* takes always and necessarily the latter form. A necessary form cannot be explained by the analogy of a variable form; and, if it could, the warrant for the objective in these abridged formulæ would still remain to be determined; and there is no possible answer except that the concurrence of *than* and the objective implies prepositional constraint on the form of the pronoun.

Than in *than whom* is a preposition, because it establishes a relation between *whom* and some other word—"none" in the traditional example from Milton; and there is no way of completing a predication here with the relative for a possible subject, as is the case with *but* and *as*. Thus, I can say "All but *he* had fled,"

or "All but *him* had fled;" and I have thus established the same general relation by two different specific methods of expression. In the second phrase, *but* is a preposition relating *all* and *him* to each other; in the first, *but* is a conjunction relating *all* and *he* severally to *had fled*, the last term being for *he* modified into negation: accordingly, the second form can be expressed in extension by "All had fled, but he had not fled." Similarly in "He is wiser than I," the extended form is possible, and we can write "He is wiser than I am (wise)." But in *than whom*, no extension is possible with *who* as a converted subject; and consequently there is no way of establishing the necessary relation by predication, the theoretical common term being impossible as a separate predicate after the relative pronoun. Accordingly, it is impossible to develop Milton's expression into "Beelzebub, *than who* sat, none higher sat;" and no such locution is found in any language. The irresistible conclusion is that, if, of two general methods of relation, one is unavailable, the other must be recognized and used even at the expense of readjusting the functions of the necessary connective, though that connective is ordinarily appropriated by the other method. This is what is done in Greek with *πρὶν* with the infinitive, however timid grammarians are in realizing the fact that their conjunction has here become an obvious preposition. Words of this diathesis are as a rule provisionally disposed of as adverbs, that part of speech being the catch-all of lost, strayed, and stolen grammaticisms. *Præter* with the nominative seems to be so regarded by commentators and annotators; but no one has ever yet detected among the functions of the adverb the power to relate predications; and *præter* followed by a nominative must relate predications, the nominative being the pendent subject of the second predication. As already hinted, there is no lack of instances to illustrate *as* followed by an objective; but such instances are naturally condemned as negligences and ignorances, even though Cardinal Newman and Matthew Arnold confessed to prejudices in favor of the construction.

Than in *than whom* is a preposition, whether illegitimately or not; because *whom*, being a

relative, involves a conjunction; and the relative admits no introductory conjunction except when two or more relative clauses are coordinately subordinated to the same antecedent, as is not the case in *than whom*, which is a single subordinate construction. *And* and *but* may coördinate two relational modifications to a common antecedent; in these cases, however, *and* and *but* really connect the repetitions of the main statement accompanied in each case by the respective relative clause. On the other hand, the *and which* construction, though it is coördinate in form, as it attempts coördination with a mere adjective preceding, is still under the ban. Gould Brown's suspicions were aroused by the conjunctive character of the relative as repudiating the conjunctive supplement of *than*; but he does not appear to have understood the necessary consequences of his misgiving. *Than* cannot in *than whom* be a conjunction, because it is impossible to supply an antecedent for *who(m)* between *than* and *who(m)*, and no conjunction ever separates a relative from its antecedent: *than* certainly, in the traditional example, separates the relative *whom* from its intended antecedent *Beelzebub*, and hence it cannot be a conjunction. Moreover, the introduction of a new formal antecedent between *than* and *whom*, if it were possible, would create an impossible exigency by establishing the basis for a new predication that could not be completed, while it would fatally dislocate one already complete and consistent. The reason a conjunction never separates a relative from its antecedent is the same reason that prohibits a conjunction between a noun and its adjective-modifier.

Furthermore, after the conjunction *than*, the clause must be such that, if *than* be omitted, the clause could stand alone as an independent sentence—a condition realized by *than* everywhere else, but impossible with *than who*. It is impossible here to complete any predication after *who*; but, even if it were not impossible, no relation could be established between such predication and the formal context.

I hope I have satisfactorily shown that *than who* is impossible grammatically and logically and that *than whom* grammatically and logically shifts *than* to the category of prepositions, just as *save* has been shifted from the verb *viā*

the preposition into the conjunction. Of course, it still remains possible, for those who cannot make up their minds, to impound innocuous desuetude for the bookish phrase for which Milton's Latinism is usually held accountable, though Shakespeare far outdid him in "than whom no mortal so magnificent." How much farther back the phrase goes, no one seems to know; but Swift, Prior, Bolingbroke and others are by Lowth cited in its illustration. Those who choose can justify *than me*, *than us*, etc., by the special analogy, though it can always be urged against them that these phrases lack the main defence of the relative combination. Some persons may wish to extend to *as* the same latitude of relation and the same adaptation of regimen; but, though *as* has some relative affinities, they are not of the kind to be cogent here. So far as *than whom* is concerned, I think the case must be closed by validating *than* as a preposition—a function plainly exemplified by the Latin and Greek equivalents, which being case-forms, are always prepositional and never conjunctive.

CASKIE HARRISON.

Brooklyn, N. Y.

ETYMOLOGICAL NOTES.

1. GERM. *bautan* in ON. *bauta* 'slay,' *beytell* 'hammer,' OE. *bēatan* 'beat, clash together, tramp, tread on,' *ge-bēat* 'beating,' *bietel* 'mallet,' OHG. *bōzan* 'beat,' may be compared with Lith. *baudziū* 'punish, chastise,' *baudimas* 'punishment.' This, of course, does not exclude the explanation given by Persson, *Wz.* 290.

2. OS. *griotan*, OE. *grēotan* 'weep' need not be connected with the synonymous Goth. *grētan*, ON. *grāta*, etc. They are rather akin to Lith. *graudžiū* 'wehmütig thun,' *graudūs* 'brittle; heartbreaking, touching.' The primary meaning here is 'breaking, crushing.' Further related are, therefore, Lith. *griūdžiū* 'stamp,' *grūdas*, Lett. *grauds* 'grain,' OCh. Sl. *gruda* 'clod,' MHG. *griez*, *grüz*, OHG. *grioz*, OE. *grēot* 'sand, grit,' ON. *grjōt* 'stone,' OE. *grūt* 'coarse meal,' *grot* 'particle, groats,' etc. (cf. Kluge, *Et. Wb.* s. v. *Griess*, *Grütze*; Prellwitz, *Et. Wb.* s. v. *χρυσός*).

The base *ghreu-d-* in the above is a derivative of *ghreu-* in Lith. *griūvū* 'fall to pieces, collapse,' *griūnu* 'break down, crash, thunder,' Gk. *χράω*, *χράύω* 'graze, scratch,' etc. (cf. Prellwitz, *Et. Wb.*).

3. In *JGPh.* I, 295 f. I connected Goth. *bliggwan* 'beat,' OHG. *blinwan* 'bläuen, schlagen,' OE. *blēowan* 'strike, apply blows' with Goth. *ga-malwan* 'crush, bruise,' ON. *molva* 'shatter,' to which also belongs Gk. *μύλλω* 'crush' < **mlūō* (Johansson, *PBB.*, 15, 232), from the root *mel-*, *mol-* 'crush, rub, grind.' The base in the above is *moīyo-*, *meīyo-*. Compare OHG. *melo*, OE. *melu* 'meal,' ME. *melwe* 'mellow, soft,' pre-Germ. **melyo-* 'crushed, soft,' Skt. *malvā-s* 'unbesonnen, töricht,' Lith. *malvinu* 'zahm machen,' Gk. *μῶλός* 'feeble, sluggish,' *μῶλυσίς* 'breaking, crushing, softening,' *μῶλύω* 'enfeeble, dull, blunt,' *μολύνω* 'stain, sully,' primarily 'rub, smear,' *μέλεος* 'useless, vain,' from **meīyo-s*, *ἀμβλύνω* 'blunt, dull,' *ἀμβλύνω* 'blunt, dulled; dull, obtuse; dim, faint, weak; spiritless, slack, sluggish' (cf. Prellwitz, *Et. Wb.* s. v. *μέλεος*). With these compare the following:

OE. *blēap*, pre-Germ. **mlōu-tu-*, 'timid, sluggish,' OHG. *blōdi*, MHG. *blæde* 'zerbrechlich; gebrechlich, schwach; zaghaft,' OS. *blōð* 'timid,' ON. *blauðr* 'weak, sluggish, timid,' *bleyða* 'coward,' OSw. *blōðher* 'timid,' Goth. *blauþjan* 'make void, abolish.' Compare the base *mlā-* in Skt. *mlāyati* 'welkt, erschläft, wird schwach,' Gk. *βλάξ* 'slack, inactive, sluggish, spiritless, stupid; effeminate, delicate, fastidious, braggart.'

With these we may compare the Germ. base *blauta-*, *blotta-* (probably from **mloutnō-*, **mlutnō-*) in OE. *blēat* 'bringing misery,' MHG. *blōz* 'naked,' bare, unprotected,' OSw. *blotter*, Sw. *blott* 'bar, blossom,' OFries. *blāt* 'bare, poor.' Here the primary meaning is 'crush, rub, wear off, strip.' Compare Skt. *dhā-bhas-ti* 'crush:' OHG. *bar* 'bare;' Gk. *ψῆν* 'rub, wipe,' *ψίω* 'crush:' *ψίλος* 'bare, naked, bald;' Lat. *terō* 'rub; rub off,' etc.

4. Distinct from this is another Germ. base *blauta-*, *blota-* 'wet, soaked, bloated,' etc. This is rather from the root *bhleyo-*, *bhlū-* 'swell, overflow.' Compare Gk. *φλέω* 'gush, over-

flow,' *φλύω* 'swell over, overflow, bubble over, babble,' *φλύζω* 'overflow,' *φλυδαίω* 'have an excess of moisture, become soft or flabby,' *φλυδαρός* 'soft, flabby:' ON. *blautr* 'wet, moist, soft, tender, weak,' *bleyta* 'soft, wet ground,' *bleyta* 'wet, soften,' *blotna* 'become wet,' OSw. *blotna*, *blutna*, same, *blöter* 'soft, weak, timid,' Sw. *blöt* 'wet, soaked,' Dan. *bløde* 'rain shower,' *bløde* 'soak, soften,' *blød* 'soft,' E. *bloat* 'make or grow turgid as by effusion of liquid in the cellular tissue; puff out, swell; puff up, make vain,' *bloated* 'turgid, swollen; puffed up, pompous,' *blot* 'bespatter, stain, soil.'

In this last group it is possible that the two pre-Germ. bases *bhleu-* and *mlau-* have fallen together. For the meaning 'soft, weak' might come from 'crush, crumble' as in Gk. *βλάξ*, or 'swell, overflow' as in *φλυδαρός*. From 'soft, weak' are derived secondary meanings. In these it is still more difficult to decide what the primary signification was. So, for example, OHG. *blōz* 'proud' may have meant primarily 'rubbed, tender, soft, effeminate,' and then 'proud, haughty,' from *mlu-* 'rub, crush.' In this case the word is related to MHG. *blōz* 'bare,' that is 'rubbed, stripped.' Or it may have come from 'wet, soft, effeminate' and be cognate with ON. *blautr* 'wet, moist, tender, weak,' root *bhlu-* 'swell, flow.' Or, finally, it may have come from the same root in the sense 'swell,' as in E. *bloated*. This is a frequent antecedent of the meaning 'proud.'

Though many of the secondary meanings in the above groups of words might have come from 'crush, soften' or 'wet, soften,' it is improbable that MHG. *blōz* 'bare, naked' is connected with ON. *blautr* 'wet, moist.' I see but one way of combining them, and that is through the base *mlu-* 'rub, crush.' From 'rub,' as we have seen, naturally develops 'strip, make bare.' From 'rub, crush' may also come 'soften, make tender,' and from this the secondary idea 'moist, wet.' Compare Gk. *τείρω* 'rub, wear away,' *τέρην* 'soft, delicate,' *τεράμων* 'soft, tender, becoming soft by boiling,' Skt. *tárūna-s* 'young, tender, fresh,' NPers. *tar*, *tarr* 'fresh, moist' (cf. Uhlenbeck, *Ai. Wb.*). Here the primary meaning is entirely lost sight of. So also in Skt. *vijátē* 'tremble, flee,' OHG. *wihhan* 'give way, weichen:' NHG. *einweichen* 'soak, steep,

macerate, drench.' Nevertheless I think it more probable that MHG. *blōz* 'bare' is from the root *mlu-* 'rub,' and ON. *blautr* 'wet' from *bhlu-* 'flow.' In any case the two words cannot both come from *bhlu-* 'flow.'

5. But there is other evidence for the root *bhlu-* in Germ. Compare the words assigned above to *bhlu-* with Lat. *fluō*, *fluxi* 'flow,' *fluctuō* 'undulate, waver, hesitate,' OHG. *blūgisōn* 'waver, hesitate,' MHG. *blūc*, *blinc* 'wavering, timid, bashful,' NHG. (Swiss) *blug*, *blugsam* 'timid,' *blügen* 'intimidate,' OE. *blycgan* 'terrify,' OSw. *blygher*, ON. *bljügr*, Sw. *blyg*, Dan. *blý* 'timid, bashful' (cf. Schade, *Wb.* s. v. *blūc*; Tamm, *Et. Ordb.* s. v. *blyg*). While this group is easily combined with ON. *blautr* 'wet,' etc., it is not easily connected with OHG. *blōdi* 'zerbrechlich; gebrechlich, schwach; zaghaft,' etc. For the meaning 'timid' in the two groups has developed in entirely distinct ways. We are, therefore, justified in assuming for the Germ. stems *blauþu-* 'fragile, frail, weak, sluggish, timid,' *blautu-* 'stripped, bare,' *blautu-* 'wet, soft,' *blūga-* 'wavering,' two distinct roots *mlu-* and *bhlu-*.

6. OHG. *faro* 'farbig, gefärbt,' *farawa* 'farbe, schminke,' *farawen* 'färben, malen, schminken' are from a pre-Germ. base **poru-* whose primary meaning was probably 'variegated, parti-colored.' Compare Av. *pouru-šō* 'scheckig, bunt,' Skt. *paru-śā-s* 'knotig; rauh, uneben; fleckig, bunt,' *pāruṣ* 'knoten, internodium, gelenk.' These are formed on the base **poru-* or **peru-* and are further related to Skt. *parva* 'knot, joint, division,' *pārvaṭa-s* 'mountain, rock,' Gk. *πέρας* 'end,' Hom. *πείρατα* from **περFara* 'boundaries' (Brugmann, *Grd.* I, 401).

7. OE. *hlāford* 'lord, patron, master,' *hlāfdige* 'lady, mistress of a household' are supposed to be compounds, with *hlāf* 'loaf' as the first element. This is extremely doubtful. They are rather from a lost **hlāf*, Germ. **hlaiba-* 'protection,' which we may assume from ON. *hlif* 'shield, protection, defense,' *hlifa*, OHG. *liban* 'protect, spare,' Goth. *hleibjan* 'spare, assist.' The development 'protection, protector, lord' is a natural one. Compare OE. *helm* 'helmet, covering: protector, lord,' *hlēow* 'covering, protection: protector,' *weard* 'guardian, protector, lord, king.'

8. OE. *hyrst* 'ornament, jewel; trappings, equipment, armor,' *hyrstan* 'adorn, equip,' OHG. *rust* 'armor,' *rusten* 'adorn, equip, prepare' do not belong to OE. *hrēodan*, as given by Kluge, *Et. Wb.* s. v. *rüsten*. They are rather from a pre-Germ. stem **qrs-ti-*, which would give in Germ. *hursti-*, *hrusti-*. This stem is most closely related to OChSl. *krasa* 'beauty,' *krasiti* 'adorn,' Pol. *krasa* 'beauty, color,' Lith. *krōsas* 'color, paint,' *krōsyti* 'color,' etc. The underlying meaning of the group is probably 'overlay, überziehen, cover.'

9. E. *left*, akin to ODu. *luft*, *lucht*, Fries. *leeft* 'left,' is no doubt, as is usually given, from OE. *left*, *lyft* 'weak,' pre-Germ. **lpti-*, a derivative of the base in OE. *lēf* < **lōfi-* 'infirm, diseased, ill,' *ge-lēfed* 'weak, old.' With these compare Lith. *alpnas* 'schwach, ohnmächtig,' *alpsti* 'pine away, faint,' Gk. *ἀλαπαδνός* 'weakened, feeble,' *ἀλαπαζω* 'empty, drain, exhaust, overcome, slay, waste,' *λαπαζω* 'empty, plunder, purge' (bowels), *λαπαδνός* 'weak, powerless,' *λαπαρός* 'loose,' Skt. *alpa*, *alpaka* 'small, weak' (cf. Prellwitz, *Et. Wb.*; Uhlenbeck, *Al. Wb.*).

The primary meaning of this group was probably 'flow, flow out; cause to flow out, empty, exhaust,' whence 'weaken, plunder, waste, destroy,' etc. We may, therefore, connect the above with ON. *elfr*, Dan. *elv* 'stream, river,' OE. *lafian* 'pour, wash,' OHG. *labōn* 'wash, refresh,' *lab* 'broth.'

10. E. *lush* 'full of juice or succulence' is supposed to be an abbreviation of *luscious*, older *lushious* (Spenser), *lussyouse* (Palsgrave). This is, however, improbable on the face of it. It is more likely that *lushious*, *luscious* was transformed from *lush* in imitation of *delicious*, and that *lush* goes back to an OE. **lusc* 'moist, juicy.' In proof of this explanation compare Icel. *lyskra* 'moisture in hay, or a damp wisp of hay.'

11. Germ. *tina-* 'tin:' OE., ON., Dan., Du. *tin*, OHG. *zin*, NHG. *zinn*, from pre-Germ. **dino-m*, doubtless received its name from its color, and meant primarily 'bright, shining.' We may, therefore, compare Skt. *dina-m* 'day,' which is phonetically an exact equivalent and, like pre-Germ. **dino-m*, meant 'bright.' The Skt. word has been connected with the synony-

mous OChSl. *dīnī*, Lith. *dėnà*, OPruss. *deina*, and with Goth. *sin-teins* 'daily,' etc., all from the root *đi-* 'shine,' Skt. *didāti*, Gk. *δέαται* 'shines.' The root *đi-* 'shine' is also in OE., OS. *tir*, ON. *tirr* 'glory, honor,' OHG. *zēri*, *ziari* 'splendid, beautiful,' *ziari* 'splendor, beauty, ornament,' Lith. *dailūs* 'beautiful' (cf. author, *Pub. Mod. Lang. Ass'n.* xiv, 334). On the derivation of *tin* from the meaning 'bright,' compare OHG. *elo* 'yellow:' Lith. *alvas* 'tin,' OPruss. *alwis* 'lead' (Uhlenbeck, *PBB.*, xxii, 537); Skt. *bradhñā* 'reddish, pale:' *bradhñā-m* 'lead.'

FRANCIS A. WOOD.

Cornell College.

SPENSER AND "E. K."

A long controversy, familiar to all students of Spenser, has been carried on concerning the identity of the editor of the *Shepherd's Calendar*. This person signs himself simply "E. K." The majority of commentators have persuaded themselves that "E. K." stands for Edward Kirke (1553-1613) a contemporary of Spenser's at Pembroke College. A few scholars, however, of whom Dr. H. O. Sommer is perhaps the most authoritative, and in this matter the most positive, are convinced that "E. K." is no other than Spenser himself.¹

The issue is of some importance, since statements are made in the "literary apparatus" of "E. K.", which, if made by Spenser himself, certainly must seriously discredit him.

I believe that all who have discussed this question have assumed, tacitly, the extreme alternatives that (1) either Spenser must have written the "Glosse" wholly, or (2) another person, "E. K.", is solely responsible for it. The somewhat obvious third possibility, that Spenser and any other person, "E. K.", may have been jointly responsible, seems to have escaped notice. Such a joint editorship would, I believe, meet all difficulties thus far raised on both sides of the question. There are positive evidences, moreover, in favor of the supposition.

The epistle of "E. K." is dated April 10,

¹ *The Shep. Cal.*, Facsimile Repr., London, Nimmo, 1890, Introd.

1579; the *Calender* was not entered at Stationers' Hall until December 5, 1579; during the interim of approximately eight months the volume was presumably passing through the press. Now in his epistle "E. K." is evidently writing in Spenser's absence, "him selfe (Spenser) being for long time furre estraunged." Possibly this means that Spenser was on a mission to Sir Henry Sidney in Ireland, as Grosart thinks. In any case "E. K." represents himself as editing the *Calender* for the time being on his own responsibility, but justifying himself "for that by means of some familiar acquaintance I was made privie to his counsell and secret meaning." This last statement by itself would seem to indicate that "E. K." had received fairly definite instructions from the now absent poet.

Spenser was not long absent, however. By the fifth (sixteenth?) of October, 1579, we find him writing to Harvey from Leicester House. He is now in personal communication with "E. K.", since in the body of the letter we read "Maister E. K. hartily desireth to be commended unto your Worshipp." The *Calender* must by this time have been well under way in the printing, and it is hardly credible that its author should not have gone over "E. K.'s" annotations with him, correcting, advising, suggesting.

His time in London, however, was short. In the same letter just cited, he announces to Harvey a decidedly extended trip to the Continent in the service of "my Lorde", Leicester. In the Latin Epistle to Harvey accompanying the letter, he describes himself as "mox in Gallias navigaturi," and indeed

per inhospita Caucasa longè,
Perque Pyræneos montes, Babilonaque turpem,—

to Spain and Rome, that is, and perhaps farther. Later he says in English that he will be gone "(I hope, I feare, I thinke) the next weeke, if I can be dispatched of my Lorde."

Now if Spenser went on this mission, and I am aware of no ground for doubting it, he must have left what may have been still to complete in the "Glosse" to "E. K.'s" sole discretion. If he took any such journey as he indicated to Harvey, by the time of his return to England the *Calender* must have been already published.

Now from these premises the conclusion seems clear. The "literary apparatus" of the *Shepherd's Calender* is probably a composite piece of work, part of which Spenser had the opportunity to suggest and revise, part of which he had not. The result shows, on the one hand, that seeming-strange insight of "E. K." which leads Dr. Sommer and others to feel that Spenser himself must be guiding the pen of the annotator, and, on the other hand, those frequent blunders and incomprehensible oversights which lead Prof. Herford and others to feel that "E. K.'s" insight was very imperfect indeed. Spenser was guiding the pen of "E. K." but for a brief and hurried period only, namely, when in London with "E. K." just before his Continental journey, —then, and possibly also earlier in that uncertain period of intimacy to which "E. K." alludes in his epistle.

JEFFERSON B. FLETCHER.

Harvard University.

gray AND grey.

IN MOD. LANG. NOTES for November, 1897, p. 223, Mr. Andrew Ingraham raised the question whether there is any distinction in meaning between the words *gray* and *grey*. The following passage was quoted in illustration:

"A neutral tint is a compound shadow colour of a cool neutral character. It is not very permanent, as the gray is apt to become grey by exposure."

Thinking that the question was of some importance in its bearings upon matters of English usage, I recently set about obtaining the data for an answer. My method was as follows. To a class of students whom I will call Group i, I dictated the passage quoted above. For a second class (Group ii) which met the following hour, I wrote the two words upon the blackboard. To each group I said merely that a question had arisen in regard to the distinction between the two words; I wanted to know what the class thought about it. Each student was then asked to record briefly his opinions or impressions.

The total number of students was one hundred and six, of whom forty-eight belonged to

the first group, fifty-eight to the second. Upon examining the papers I found that eighty-one had noted a distinction in meaning, though upon grounds so various as to make generalization difficult.

Eleven of the first group and fourteen of the second could detect no difference of meaning. Two, however, qualified the negative by saying that they would expect a difference in pronunciation, like that (to quote from one of the papers) "between *Harry* and *hairy*." Another, although he could detect no difference in the denotations, affirmed that the word *grey* reminded him of the Biblical *shew*. On that account it seemed older than the other form.

The following tints were associated by some of the students with the two forms under consideration: With *gray*, pink, drab, and blue; with *grey*, blue, red, brown, green, and silver.

But on this point only a few expressed themselves.

The object to which *gray* was thought to apply were weather-beaten lumber, rough stone, dress goods, the sky, and, in general, objects of nature. *Grey* was connected with a somewhat longer list, comprising slate (or smooth stone of any kind), cloth, veiling, ashes, hair, the complexion and animals.

Twenty-one thought *gray* was the lighter color, ten thought *grey* was lighter. The vote on this point in Group ii, where the students were uninfluenced by any context, was ten to three in favor of *gray*.

Two of the first group and seven of the second referred to *gray* as a cheerful color, to *grey* as a dismal color.

I append an abstract of thirty of the answers:

I. WITH CONTEXT.

Gray.

1. More clouded. Applied to something made, as a hat or gown.
2. Color of weather-beaten lumber.
3. Pure and clear.
4. Lighter and more cheerful.
5. Darker, as if produced by a thick coat of paint.
6. A cold combination of black and white.
7. Mottled; the color of rough-cut stone.
8. More clearly defined; stands out by itself.
9. A color akin to drab, with a pinkish tone.
10. A gray house is sprinkled with white, though sparsely.
11. Drab white.
12. Smooth, clear and glossy.
13. Smooth and soft.
14. Smooth and even.
15. Dark and heavy.

Grey.

1. Indicates a larger expanse of color. Applied to things in nature, as rocks and the like.
2. Blue tint of stone or slate, or of delicate veiling.
3. A faded, lighter color.
4. Darker; associated with dismal weather.
5. Lighter, as if thinly painted.
6. A warm effect obtained by the addition of a touch of red or blue.
7. Softer, smoother, and more uniform. Color of smooth, evenly woven cloth.
8. Blends with surrounding objects.
9. The color of dark hair when it turns.
10. A grey house is nearly white.
11. Faded almost to white.
12. Muddied appearance; darker.
13. Dark, harsh, and rough.
14. Mottled and worn.
15. Lighter; more transparent.

II. WITHOUT CONTEXT.

Gray.

16. Suggests a big block of dark color.
17. A silver sheen. More pleasing.
18. Connected with cloth.
19. Applied to goods.
20. Any mixture of black and white.
21. A dark color. The word pronounced grā.
22. Brighter.
23. More white than black in the mixture.
24. Gives a picture of a soft yet solid substance, silvery white like dress-goods. Vowel broad.
25. Dull slate color.
26. Hard, stony and cold, as a steel-gray.
27. Connected with persons.
28. Bluish shade; soft.
29. Used of nature, as a gray day.
30. Connected with woolens or cloth generally. A pinkish shade.

The differences of impression seem to be traceable to four principal sources. I enumerate them in the probable order of their importance:

1. Chance association (as, in Group i, with the immediate context).
2. Habitual association.
3. The appearance of the word when written or printed, the effect being due to associations of an obscure nature.
4. The sound of the word. The differences in this instance may be due to chromesthesia or 'color-hearing.'

FRED NEWTON SCOTT.

University of Michigan.

PARALLELS BETWEEN SHAKSPERE'S *Sonnets* AND *Love's Labour's Lost*.

ALL the commentators upon Shakspeare's sonnets have noted a few parallels between the

Grey.

16. Suggests a grey sky.
17. More somber; seldom used.
18. Connected with an image of a greyhound.
19. Applied to cats.
20. A greenish gray.
21. A very light color. The word pronounced grā, but very short, almost grē.
22. Somber and mournful. Always supposed the distinction was a foolish personal predilection.
23. White and black in equal proportion.
24. Hazy and vague like a vapor. Suggests gloomy thoughts.
25. Greenish tinge.
26. Softer and warmer.
27. Used abstractly.
28. Cold, brownish drab.
29. Used of hair.
30. Almost white. Suggests side-walks and the sky on a cloudy day. Bluish tinge.

Sonnets and Shakspeare's *Love's Labour's Lost*, yet none, so far as we know, has marked special citations to show the remarkably close attachment of the *Sonnets*, by word and imagery, to this play. After a general fashion the near kinship of the *Sonnets* to the early dramatic work of Shakspeare has often been acknowledged. Moreover, Mr. Sidney Lee observes that

"in phraseology the sonnets often closely resemble such early dramatic efforts as 'Love's Labour's Lost' and 'Romeo and Juliet'."

The presence of the three sonnets, the poetical tributes paid to the educational value of women's eyes, the extravagant praise of the unfashionably complexioned 'Dark Lady,' and the perjured oaths of the King and his followers under the potent spell of Love, as depicted in the play of *Love's Labour's Lost*, all these have naturally caught the attention of readers of both *Sonnets* and play, even though casual readers.

These characteristics of the play together with many other approved data have adduced all critics to assign this dramatic work to the earliest place. Such an array of proof can never be drawn up for the *Sonnets*, yet the great similarity between certain sonnets and the play almost forces one to think of an equally close relationship as regards time of composition. Two of the latest authorities may be quoted upon this question, Mr. Sidney Lee and Mr. George Wyndham. The former believes that the time of composition falls between "the spring of 1593 and the autumn of 1594;" while the latter, after a certain assumption, says,

"we may infer that the latest group (C—cxxxvi.) was not written *before* May 1600, possibly not *before* May 1602; and that the earlier groups, which are fairly continuous, were not written *before* 1597, possibly not *before* 1599."

It is a mooted question, bandied about by one authority after another, and little confidence may be bestowed upon any new scheme to solve the mystery.

Two classes of parallels we wish to present: one, in which the thought or imagery seems to be correspondent, though this may not always be in the exact phraseology; and a second, in which the mere word is sufficiently forcible to attract the attention. This latter classification is of no value in itself, is often overdone in tediously critical texts.

In quoting the following correspondences no credit will be given to Messrs. Dowden, Wyndham, and other examiners, for the few citations in their editions of the *Sonnets* do not emphasize any special connections between the *Sonnets* and this particular play.

The sonnet is first quoted and the parallel in the play follows.

Son. iv, 1-4, "Lo, in the Orient when the gracious light
Lifts up his burning head, each under eye
Doth homage to his new-appearing sight,
Serving with looks his sacred majesty."

L.L.L. iv, iii, 216-223, "Who sees the heavenly Rosalind,
That, like a rude and savage man of Inde,
At the first opening of the gorgeous east,
Bows not his vassal head, and stricken blind
Kisses the base ground with obedient breast?
What peremptory eagle-sighted eye
Dares look upon the heaven of her brow,
That is not blinded by her majesty?"

Son. xi, 9-14, "Let those whom Nature hath not made for
store,
Harsh, featureless, and rude, barrenly perish:
Look, whom she best endow'd, she gave the
more;
Which bounteous gift thou shouldst in bounty
cherish."

L.L.L. ii, i, 9, "Be now as prodigal of all dear grace
As Nature was in making graces dear.
When she did starve the general world beside
And prodigally gave them all to you."

The eye being the best reflector of the beauty of the face, it becomes the favorite conceit in Shakspeare's *Sonnets* as with all the other sonneteers. This conceit of the 'eye' is likewise the favorite figure of Byron's eloquent speeches. All commentators have noted the presence of this conceit in both *Sonnets* and play.

Son. xiv, 9, "But from thine eyes my knowledge I derive."

L.L.L. iv, iii, 345, "From women's eyes this doctrine I derive:" etc.

Son. xvii, 5, "If I could write the beauty of your eyes

And in fresh numbers number all your graces,"

L.L.L. iv, iii, 308, "Teaches such beauty as a woman's
eye!"

and again

317-8, "Such fiery numbers as the prompting eye
Of beauty's tutors have enriched you
with?"

Son. xx, 5-6 "An eye more bright than theirs, less false in
rolling,

Gilding the object whereupon it gazeth,"

L.L.L. v, ii, 752, "Form'd by the eye, and therefore, like
the eye,

Full of strange shapes, of habits, and of forms,

Varying in subjects as the eye doth roll

To every varied object in his glance."

Son. xxiii, 14 "To hear with eyes belongs to love's fine
wit."

L.L.L. ii, i, 241, "Methought all his senses were lock'd in
his eye,"

and

251, "I have only made a mouth of his eye,"

Many other passages might be cited in which the chief conceit is this confusion of the other senses with eyesight, through the magical influence of love.

Son. xxiv, 10-11, "Mine eyes have drawn thy shape, and
thine for me

Are windows to my breast,"

L.L.L. v, ii, 828, "Behold the window of my heart, mine
eye,"

In the *Sonnets* elaborate descriptions are given of the constant warfare between the

heart and the eye, and *Son.* xlvi brings the case to trial to determine "the clear eye's moiety and the dear heart's part;" while *Son.* xlvii announces that "betwixt mine eye and heart a league is took." The dispute is continued in *Son.* cxli and this conclusion reached:

"In faith, I do not love thee with mine eyes,
For they in thee a thousand errors note;
But 'tis my heart that loves what they despise,"

Likewise in the play the heart is constantly conceived of as betrayed by the eye: *L.L.L.* ii, i, 228,

"By the heart's still rhetoric disclosed with eyes,"

and again,

233, "Why, all his behaviors did make their retire
To the court of his eye, peeping thorough desire;
His heart, like an agate, with your print impress'd,
Proud with his form, in his eye pride express'd;"

Love also creates havoc with the eyes and causes strange visions:

Son. cxxxvii, "Thou blind fool, Love, what dost thou to mine eyes,
That they behold, and see not what they see?" etc.
i, 13, "In things right true my heart and eyes have erred."

Again,

Son. cxlviii, i, "O me, what eyes hath Love put in my head,
Which have no correspondence with true sight!"
i, 8-9, "Love's eye is not so true as all men's:
no
How can it? O, how can Love's eye be true,
That is so vexed with watching and with tears?"
L.L.L. iv, iii, 328-9, "It (Love) adds a precious seeing to the eye;
A lover's eye will gaze an eagle blind;"

again,

V, ii, 750-3, "As love is full of unbefitting strains,
All wanton as a child, skipping and vain,
Form'd by the eye, and therefore, like the eye,
Full of strange shapes, of habits, and of forms,"

And this power of the eye to create strange shapes and monsters is touched upon again in *Son.* cxiv, 2-7,

"Or whether shall I say, mine eyes saith true,
And that your love taught in this alchemy,
To make monsters and things indigest
Such cherubins as your sweet self resemble,
Creating every bad a perfect best,
As fast as objects to his beams assemble?"

Beauty itself is determined by the eye, *Son.* cxxxvii, 3-4,

"They (the eyes) know what beauty is, see where it lies,
Yet what the best is take the worst to be,"
L.L.L. II, i, 15, Beauty is bought by judgement of the eye,"

Though not of the fashionable color, Rosaline's black eyes are magnets,

L.L.L. III, i, 195 "With two pitch-balls stuck in her face for eyes."

Also in *Son.* cxxvii, 9-10,

"Therefore my mistress' eyes are raven black,
Her eyes so suited, and they mourners seem."

likewise

Son. cxxxii, "As those two mourning eyes become thy face:"

These last quotations have introduced us to the "Dark Lady," and we may now pass on to a view of her features as well as the various plays on light and darkness in these two works. The two most often cited and conspicuous passages are the following:

Son. cxxvii, "In the old age black was not counted fair,
Or if it were, it bore not beauty's name;
But now is black beauty's successive heir,
And beauty slander'd with a bastard shame:
For since each hand hath put on nature's power,
Fairing the foul with art's false borrow'd face,
Sweet beauty hath no name, no holy bower,
But is profaned, if not lives in disgrace.
Therefore my mistress' eyes are raven black,
Her eyes so suited, and they mourners seem
At such who, not born fair, no beauty lack,
Slandering creation with a false esteem:
Yet so they mourn, becoming of their woe,
That every tongue says beauty should look so."

In *L.L.L.* it is principally the tilt between Biron and his friends over the black complexion of Rosaline that reveals the same characteristics and also attempts to establish a new standard of beauty. The King sportively says, iv, iii, 249,

"O paradox! Black is the badge of hell,
The hue of dungeons, and the shade of night;
And beauty's crest becomes the heavens well."

Biron's answer accords with the sonnet just quoted in full. He replies,

"Devils soonest tempt, resembling spirits of light,
O, if in black my lady's brows be deck'd,
It mourns that painting and usurping hair
Should ravish doters with a false aspect;
And therefore she is born to make black fair.
Her favour turns the fashion of the days;
For native blood is counted painting now,
And therefore red, that would avoid dispraise,
Paints itself black, to imitate her brow."

Note the striking and similar conceit in line 3, of the sonnet cited, and that expressed in line 256 *L.L.L.* Other plays on fairness and blackness may be cited: these are not all, however, descriptive of the 'Dark Lady.' Blackness may be cited:

Son. xxi, 4-5, "And every fair with his fair doth rehearse,
Making a couplement of proud compare,"
L.L.L. v, ii, 36-7, "I were the fairest goddess on the ground,
I am compar'd to twenty thousand fairs,"
Son. cxxxii, 13-4, "Then will I swear beauty herself is black,
And all they foul that thy complexion lack."
L.L.L. iv, iii, 246-8, "That I may swear beauty doth but
lack,
If that she learn not of her eye to look;
No face is fair that is not full so black,"

and

Son. cxxxi, 12, "Thy black is fairest in my judgement's place."

Such a 'black beauty' requires not the additional charm of paint:

Son. xxi, 1-2, "So is it not with me as with that Muse
Stirr'd by a painted beauty to his verse,"
L.L.L. i, i, 13-4, "my beauty, though but mean,
Needs not the painted flourish of your
praise;"
Son. lxii, 9, 14, "But when my glass shows me myself in-
deed,"
"Painting my age with beauty of thy days,"
L.L.L. iv, i, 16-8, "Nay, never
paint me now;
Where fair is not, praise cannot mend the
brow.
Here, good my glass, take this for telling
true;"

also *Son.* lxxxii, after praising the fairness of his friend, "in true plain words by thy true-telling friend," criticizes those that "have devised what strained touches rhetoric can lend," and believes that "their gross painting might be better used where cheeks need blood." Compare also *Son.* lxxxiii, 1-2,

"I never saw that you did painting need,
And therefore to your fair no painting set;"

Further truth and beauty agree in not requiring the painter's art:

Son. ci, 6-7, "Truth needs no colour, with his colour fix'd;
Beauty no pencil, beauty's truth to lay;"

In same manner the fair is contrasted with the foul, and similarly light with dark, and day with night:

Son. cxxvii, 6, "Fairing the foul with art's false borrowed
face,"
Son. cxxxvii, 12, "To put fair truth upon so foul a face?"
L.L.L. iv, i, 19, "Fair payment for foul words is more than
due."
iv, i, 23, "A giving hand, though foul, shall have
fair praise."
v, ii, 342, "Fair in all hail is foul,"

Thus also the contrast between day and night, light and darkness:

Son. xliii, 13-4, "All days are nights to see till I see thee,
And nights bright days when dreams do
show thee me."
L.L.L. i, i, 46, "And make a dark night too of half the day,"
Son. 6, 3-4, "Spend'st thou thy fury on some worthless song,
Darkening thy power to lend base subjects light?"
L.L.L. i, i, 75, "Light seeking light doth light of light be-
guile;
So, ere you find where light in darkness lies,
Your light grows dark by losing of your eyes."

Likewise *Son.* xliii is an elaborate play upon the power of the eyes to see in the darkness of the night, "When most I wink, then do mine eyes best see," and the sleeping and not winking is one of Biron's troubles, "to sleep but three hours in the night, and not be seen to wink all the day." *L.L.L.* i, i, 42-3. The conceit of the dark clouds overcasting the moon occurs in *Son.* xxxiii, xxxiv, and xxxv, as follows:

"Anon permit the basest clouds to ride
With ugly rack on his celestial face,"
"Tis not enough that though the cloud thou break,
To dry the rain on my storm-beaten face,"
"Clouds and eclipses stain both moon and sun,"

And in *L.L.L.* v, ii, 204, Rosaline plays on this idea of cloud, moon and face,

"My face is but a moon, and clouded too."

The King replies,

"Blessed are clouds, to do as such clouds do!
Vouchsafe, bright moon,—and these thy stars,—to shine,
Those clouds remov'd, upon our watery eyne."

Two sonnets describe the roses, their color, and their masked buds:

- Son.* liv. 8, "When summer's breath their masked buds discloses:"
- Son.* cxxx, 5-6, "I have seen roses damask'd, red and white,
But no such roses see I in her cheeks:"
- L.L.L.* i, ii, 86, "My love is most immaculate white and red,"
- v, ii, 297, "Fair ladies mask'd are roses in their bud;
Dismask'd, their damask sweet commixture shown,
Are angels vailing clouds, or roses blown,"
- V, ii, 295, "Blown like sweet roses in this summer air."

There are few cross references to 'love' between the *Sonnets* and the play, this not being the favorite theme of the play as its name would imply, while 'love', on the other hand, is the chief theme of many of the sonnets.

- Son.* lxxvi, 9-10, "O, know, sweet love, I always write of you,
And you and love are still my argument;"
- L.L.L.* v, ii, 83-4, "Love doth approach disguis'd
Armed in arguments;"
- Son.* cii, 3-4, "That love is merchandized whose rich esteeming
The owner's tongue doth publish everywhere."
- L.L.L.* ii, i, 15-6, "Beauty is bought by judgment of the eye,
Not utter'd by base sale of chapmen's tongues."
- Son.* xxxii, 7, "Reserve them for my love, not for their rime,"
- L.L.L.* v, ii, 6, "Nothing but this! yes, as much love in rhyme"
- Son.* lxxii, 9-10, "O, lest your true love may seem false in this,
That you for love speak well of me untrue,"
- L.L.L.* i, ii, 159, "And how can that be true love which is
falsely attempted?"
- Son.* cxlii, 9, "Be it lawful I love thee, as thou lovest those."
- L.L.L.* iv, iii, 280, "Our loving lawful, and our faith not
torn."
- Son.* cxxxi, 6, "Thy face hath not the power to make love
groan:"
- L.L.L.* iv, iii, 177, "Or groan for love?"
- Son.* cxliv, 1, "Two loves I have" etc., one being called
the 'better angel'
the other the 'worse spirit' and 'bad angel.'

Armado says in

- L.L.L.* i, ii, 160, "Love is a familiar: Love is a devil:
there is no evil angel but Love."

Time is one of the leading conceits in the *Sonnets*; it is conceived of as the great enemy of the beauty, youth, and fame of the poet's friend in the early sonnets, an enemy to be withstood only by the enduring fame of the poems themselves. The play in hand could not use such a theme to any great extent, yet the opening lines contain the very idea that is again and again elaborated in the course of the *Sonnets*.

- L.L.L.* i, i, 1-7, "Let fame, that all hunt after in their lives,
Live register'd upon our brazen tombs,

And then grace us in the disgrace of death;
When, spite of cormorant devouring Time,
The endeavour of this present breath may
buy
That honour which shall bate his scythe's
keen edge
And make us heirs of all eternity."

- Son.* xix, 1, "Devouring Time,"
- Son.* lx, 12-4, "And nothing stands but for his (Time's)
scythe to mow:
And yet to times in hope my verse shall stand,
Praising thy worth, despite his cruel hand."
- Son.* c, 13-4, "Give my love fame faster than time wastes
life;
So thou prevent'st his scythe and crooked
knife."
- Son.* cxvi, 9-10, "Love's not Time's fool, though rosy lips and
cheeks
Within his bending sickle's compass come;"
- Son.* cxxiii, 14, "I will be true, despite thy scythe and thee,"
- Son.* ci, 11-2, "To make him much outlive a gilded tomb
And to be praised of ages yet to be."
- Son.* cvii, 13-4, "And thou in this shalt find thy monument,
When tyrants' crests and tombs of brass are
spent."
- L.L.L.* iv, iii, 269, "I'll prove her fair, or talk till doomsday
here."
- Son.* lv, 10-2, "your praise shall still find room"
Even in the eyes of all prosperity
That wear this world out to the ending
doom,"
- L.L.L.* v, ii, 778-9, "A time methinks, too short
To make a world-without-end bargain
in."
- Son.* lvii, 5, "Nor dare I chide the world-without-end hour"
- Numerous passages may be cited where the play upon words furnishes striking parallels:
- Son.* lxxviii, 12, "And arts with thy sweet graces graced be;"
- L.L.L.* v, ii, 322, "Have not the grace to grace it with such
show."
- Son.* lxxix, 2-3, "My verse alone had all thy gentle grace;
But now my gracious numbers are decayed,"
- L.L.L.* v, i, 126, "that is the way to make an offence gracious,
though few have the grace to do it."
- Son.* xcvi, 3-4, "Both grace and faults are loved of more and
less:
Thou makest faults graces that to thee resort."
- L.L.L.* v, ii, 765-6, "And even that falsehood, in itself a sin,
Thus purifies itself and turns to grace."
- Son.* lxxviii, 8, "And given grace a double majesty."
- L.L.L.* I, i, 134, "A maid of grace and complete majesty."
- Son.* xvii, 6, "And in fresh numbers number all your graces,"
- L.L.L.* v, ii, 35, "The numbers true; and, were the number-
ing too,"
- Son.* cxxxvii, 9-10, "Why should my heart think that a
several plot
Which my heart knows the wide world's
common place?"
- L.L.L.* ii, i, 223, "My lips are no common, though several
they be."
- Son.* lxix, 5, "Thy outward thus with outward praise is
crown'd;"

- Son.* cxxv, 1-2, "Were't aught to me I bore the canopy,
With my extern the outward honouring,"
L.L.L. iv, i, 32, "When, for fame's sake, for praise, an out-
ward part,
We bend to that the working of the heart;"
Son. cxxviii, 6, "To kiss the tender inward of thy hand,"
L.L.L. v, ii, 796, "And, by this virgin palm now kissing
thine,"
Son. xx, 6-7, "my heart,
Which in thy breast doth live, as thine in me;"
L.L.L. v, ii, 806, "Hence ever then my heart is in thy
breast."
Son. xxvii, 4, "To work my mind, when body's work's ex-
pired;"
L.L.L. i, i, 25, "The mind shall banquet, though the body
pine."
Son. xxix, 2, 4, "I all alone beweepe my outcast state,"
"And look upon myself, and curse my fate,"
L.L.L. v, ii, 806-8, "So potent-like would I o'ersway his state
That he should be my fool and I his
fate."
Son. xxi, "I will not praise that purpose not to sell."
L.L.L. iv, iii, 235, "To things of sale a seller's praise be-
longs,"
Son. xlii, 9-10, "If I lose thee, my loss is my love's gain,
And losing her, my friend hath found that
loss;"
L.L.L. iv, iii, 356-7, "Let us once lose our oaths to find our-
selves,
Or else we lose ourselves to keep our
oaths."
Son. cxlvii, 9, "Past cure I am, now reason is past care,"
L.L.L. v, ii, 28, "Great reason; for past cure is still past
care."
Son. lxxvi, 7, "That every word doth almost tell my name,"
xcv, 8, "Naming thy name blesses an ill report."
cxxxvi, 13-4, "Make but my name thy love, and love that
still,
And then thou lovest me, for my name is *Will*."
L.L.L. iii, i, 163, "When tongues speak sweetly, then they
name her name."

This name, 'Will,' brings us to the famous
"Will-sonnets," and the play is not wanting in
puns upon the various meanings of 'will.'

- Son.* cxxxv, 1-2, "Whoever hath her wish, thou hast thy
Will,
And *Will* to boot, and *Will* in overplus;"
11-2, "So thou, being rich in *Will*, add to thy
Will
One will of mine, to make thy large *Will*
more."
L.L.L. ii, i, 98-9, "Not for the world, fair madam, by my
will."
"Why, will shall break it; will and nothing
else."

We quote in full *Son.* clii on swearing and
oath-breaking, for it has numerous correspon-
dences in the play, where love causes the King
and his men to be twice perjured.

- "In loving thee thou know'st I am forsworn,
But thou art twice forsworn, to me love swearing;
In act thy bed-vow broke, and new faith torn,
In vowing new hate after new love bearing.
But why of two oaths' breach do I accuse thee,
When I break twenty? I am perjured most;
For all my vows are oaths but to misuse thee,
And all my honest faith in thee is lost:
For I have sworn deep oaths of thy deep kindness,
Oaths of thy love, thy truth, thy constancy;
And, to enlighten thee, gave eyes to blindness,
Or made them swear against the thing they see;
For I have sworn thee fair; more perjured I,
To swear against the truth so foul a lie!"
L.L.L. i, i, 148, "Necessity will make us all forsworn
Three thousand times within this three
years";
For every man with his affects is born," etc.
iv, iii, 280, "Our loving lawful, and our faith not torn."
v, ii, 822, "Yet swear not, lest ye be forsworn again."
i, i, 22-3, "If you are arm'd to do as sworn to do,
Subscribe to your deep oaths, and keep it
too."

Many other examples of this conceit might be
cited in which the main idea is that love is
stronger than swearing and vowing.

It only remains to add that we have collected
many phrases in which the key-word, not a
common word, strikes a peculiar tone and sug-
gests a certain likeness or harmony of thought
in the writer's mind when penning the lines
of the *Sonnets* and the play. These are un-
usual words with no uncertain sound. They
give the tone to the thought. For the sake
of briefness a list of these words is here ap-
pended without citing the passages from which
they are taken. They are found in both the
sonnets and the play, often surrounded with
much the same verbiage:

forlorn	worth	stain
intituled	cross	both twain
gaudy	fury	sport
new-fangled	new-fired	infection
pent up	authority	compiled
saucy	rhetoric	profound
critic	eternity	light (in weight)
youth	maladies	adjunct
transgression	blot	aspect
salve	dote	idolatry
society	melancholy	star.

The play of *Love's Labour's Lost* by no
means exhausts all the parallelisms that may
be established between Shakspeare's *Sonnets*
and his other plays, but it may be carefully

and critically stated that no single play displays such a remarkable similarity of phraseology and thought as the one just examined. From comparisons of this kind we never can determine the exact time of composition, we may perhaps be open to criticism in attempting to attack these old riddles with worn-out guesses, yet one more guess may bring us nearer the truth. The guess here ventured is that the *Sonnets* are not far removed in point of time from the composition of *Love's Labour's Lost*.

C. F. McCCLUMPHA,

University of Minnesota.

GERMAN LITERATURE.

Die versunkene Glocke. Ein deutsches Märchendrama von Gerhart Hauptmann. With Introduction and Notes by THOMAS STOCKHAM BAKER, Associate in German in the Johns Hopkins University. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1900. 12mo, xviii+205 pp.

IT was a happy idea to present to American students an annotated edition of Gerhart Hauptmann's masterpiece. Surely, our colleges ought not to remain indifferent to the great literary activity of contemporary Germany. A century ago German literature was supreme in Europe, to-day it bids fair to assert that supremacy once more. Let the classics remain the backbone of our German instruction, but let us also give our students a glimpse, at least, of the mighty intellectual struggle that is going on in the Fatherland. No work is better suited to give the student an insight into the new spirit of German literature than *Die versunkene Glocke*.

The editor declines to discuss at length the symbolism of the play, and the reasons advanced by him are very sound. His purpose is to make the play "more accessible and more intelligible to English readers." The introduction contains a sketch of Hauptmann's life, a brief discussion of the sources of the play, a few remarks about the Silesian dialect and about the metre. Then follows a bibliography. The notes contain rather exhaustive arguments of all five acts, a valuable feature of the book; and High German translations of the passages

in dialect, which will doubtless be greatly appreciated by all readers.

In bringing out this book the editor had a great opportunity. He might have given us a standard edition, thereby rendering any further editions unnecessary. A standard edition would have gained for the drama many new readers and would have increased the interest in contemporary German literature at our colleges. The editor failed to improve this opportunity, for his work suffers from three serious faults: it lacks scholarship, accuracy and method. In the following I intend to show this by numerous examples. At the same time I hope to contribute something to a better understanding of the play.

Hauptmann doubtless knows how to coin words, but the editor gives him credit for rather more than the poet would claim himself. L. 90: *Hahnkrat* is not "an invention of Hauptmann." The word is as old as German literature. It occurs in Old High German, for example, Tatian 147, 7; it is common enough in Middle High German and by no means obsolete at the present day. A few examples taken at random from modern authors will suffice: Panzer, *Beiträge zur deutschen Mythologie*, München, 1848, p. 287; Bindewald, *Oberhessisches Sagenbuch*, Frankfurt am M., 1873, p. 154; Liebrecht, *Zur Volkskunde*, Heilbronn, 1878, p. 517. Cf. also Grimm and Sanders.—L. 983: *misshör* is not "formed by Hauptmann analogous to *miszverstehen*." Does the editor know the garden scene in Faust? *Misshör' mich nicht, du holdes Angesicht!*—L. 1732: *Werkeltaten*, the editor says, is "probably coined by Hauptmann." As the adjective *werkeltätig* is common enough, the statement is not correct. Hauptmann has several compounds with *Werkel*. Cf. l. 1410, stage-direction, and l. 1897.—L. 2206: *barmten*. Schneide-win is wrong in claiming that the use of this word with this signification is original with Hauptmann. The word in this sense is Silesian. Cf. Weinhold, *Beiträge zu einem schlesischen Wörterbuch*, Wien, 1855, p. 8.

A number of forms are declared "very unusual."—L. 13: *Burg* seems to the editor "a large word to be used in this connection." The word is not infrequently used of the habitations of animals: cf. Kehrein, *Wörterbuch der Weid-*

mannssprache, p. 77; Grimm, *D. W.* ii, 535. In popular language the word is sometimes used of a tree: cf. Jahn, *Die deutschen Opferbräuche*, Breslau 1884, p. 86.—There is nothing unusual about the forms *verstiegen* ll. 242, 1368, and *delirierend* l. 1027.—L. 565: *Frau Holle* is not "an unusual spelling for Hulle, Holda or Hulde." It is certainly as common as the other forms, and in popular usage far more common. Cf. Mogk in Paul's *Grundriss* i, 1106: *Die Holda, im Volksmund allgemein Frau Holle . . . genannt*.—L. 1155: *darob* is, in this sense, by no means "an almost absolute form." Cf. Grimm, *D. W.* s. v. *darob*.—L. 2361: *Wackerstein* is, of course, the same word as *Wackenstein*. Cf. Grimm, *Kindermärchen*, no. 5; Weigand, *Deutsches Wörterb.* iii, p. 1007.

A couple of philological corrections: *schmauch*, l. 18, is not connected with *Rauch*, but with the English "smoke." It cannot be said to have "the present form probably by analogy to Rauch." The word goes back to a Germanic root *smuk*, which forms derivatives according to the second ablaut series. The form *schmauch* is, therefore, entirely regular.—L. 53: *Brisingamene*. As the second part is singular, the verb should be singular. Cf. l. 2096, note.

The translations of the dialect passages into High-German contain serious mistakes. In the Introduction (p. xv) the editor cites Rückert's monograph on the Silesian dialect during the Middle Ages, and Weinhold's work on the Germans in Silesia, but he does not seem to be familiar with the two most important contributions to our knowledge of modern Silesian: Weinhold's *Beiträge* cited above, and the same author's *Ueber deutsche Dialectforschung*, Wien, 1853.¹—L. 200: *Kafferfanstlerla* had better be translated *Dachfensterlein*, though the first component is *gaffen*. Cf. Weinhold, *Beitr.*, p. 39, and Frommann, *Deutsche Mundarten* iv, 173.—L. 202: *Alerla* is not an exclamation. It is *Alterlein*, cf. l. 198 *ale*=*alt*. Wittichen addresses Thor in this familiar manner. *Alterle* is often used in Southern Germany in addressing a friend confidentially, es-

¹ To these might be added Weinhold's glossary to Karl von Holtei's *Schlesische Gedichte*, 3rd ed., Breslau, 1857.

pecially if he is to be reproved. In Sleswick-Holstein the thunder-god is referred to as *de Olde*. Cf. Mogk, Paul's *Gr.* i, 1092.—L. 211: *ock* is a favorite particle in Silesian. The editor always translates it *doch*. This is correct in some places, but the most common meaning is *nur*. Cf. Weinhold, *Beitr.*, p. 66b; Frommann, *Die deutschen Mundarten*, ii, 235, iii 252, n. 148, and Holtei's poem *Ock a wing=Nur ein wenig*. *Ock*=*nur* in ll. 211, 2340, 2367, 2432.—L. 215: *s'er* cannot mean *es ist der*; *es ist* being in Hauptmann's dialect 's *iis*, cf. ll. 508, 2430, 2476. I believe *s'er* is a contraction of *seller*, a common demonstrative pronoun in German dialects. Cf. Weinhold, *Deutsche Dialectforschung*, p. 142.—L. 331: *Aschla* is *Schüssel, Napf*, cf. Weinhold, *Beitr.*, p. 7a.—L. 341: *gequerlle* is not *Lärm*. It is derived from *quergeln*=*hin und her sich drehen, hin und her laufen*, cf. Weinhold, *Beitr.*, p. 74b. Derivatives with the prefix *ge-* and the ending *e* are common in Silesian: Weinhold, *D. Dialectforschung*, pp. 92 and 93.—L. 352: *Gloaskirbla* is *Glaskörblein*. It is a *Tragkorb* to carry glassware. One of the tricks the *Schrat* would play on the mountaineers was to upset one of these *Körblein*. Just such a story is told about Rübezahl. Cf. also Schmeller, *Bayr. Wörterb.* i, p. 1287.—L. 377: *mit dam Tuta* is singular.—L. 528: The use of the polite forms *Sie* and *Ihre* is quite out of place here.—L. 534: *Popelmoan* is not *Hampelmann*. Weinhold (*Beitr.*, p. 72) says: *Die Strohpuppen, die als Vogelscheuchen in das Getreide gestellt werden, heissen Popel. . . Ein Popel oder Popelmann erscheint als Hausgeist, mit dem die Kinder geschreckt werden*. Cf. also Grimm, *Mythol.* 4, p. 418.—L. 1134: The form *Däumerling* is not confined to Silesia, it is found in various parts of Germany. Cf. Grimm, *D. W.* ii, 850.—L. 2337: *ebs* is *ehe es*, cf. Weinhold, *Beitr.*, p. 17a.—L. 2339: *sah m'rsch* is *sehen wir es*; *man* is in Hauptmann's dialect *ma*, cf. l. 2454.—L. 2427: *s'lichte Laba* is not *das leichte Leben*, but *das lichte Leben*, cf. l. 2440 and l. 2495. The editor completely misunderstands the passage. *joan und treiba* is to hunt down and persecute. Men, being "children of darkness," hate the light and will persecute anyone of their number who tries "to walk in the light." Heinrich is not much better than

the rabble, for he, too, has rejected the light. Cf. ll. 2437 and 2440.

In some of the translations given in the notes there appears a curious lack of familiarity with German usage. A number of words and passages are obscure, but only once does the editor admit that he cannot explain a reference (l. 97).—L. 41: *Kochelbauer*. I cannot accept the interpretation "poultry-farmer." Among the many variants of *Küchlein* given by Grimm, *D. W.*, v, 2514, the form *Kochel* does not occur. I connect this word with the little river Kochel in the Giant Mountains. Kochelbauer is the peasant whose farm is near the Kochel.—In this connection it is to be noted that the geographical position of the play is far more definite than the editor seems to be aware of (p. 149). The scene of the first act is *die Silberlehne* (l. 425), doubtless the slope of the so-called *Silberkamm* or *Lahnberg* in the central part of the Giant Mountains. Some distance to the west rises *das hohe Rad*, the highest peak of the western part of the Giant Mountains, mentioned in l. 394. The scene of acts iii and iv is *unweit der Schneeegruben* (p. 71), which lie close by the *hohe Rad* and form one of the wildest parts of the Giant Mountains. They are referred to again l. 1357. The river Kochel is north of the *hohe Rad*. Cf. Baedeker, *Nordost-Deutschland*, pp. 172, 177, 179, and map of the Giant Mountains; also Grube, *Geographische Charakterbilder*, Leipzig, 1885, vol. i, pp. 147-148.—L. 60: *Trulle* may mean "a low wench," but not here. Rautendelein would not say that to her own image. Weinhold (*Beitr.*) glosses it *dickes Frauenzimmer*, Sanders *plumpe Weibsperson*. It is used here as a mild term of reproach.—L. 103: the translation in the note is quite impossible; *was* is not adverbial, it is the indefinite pronoun. We might paraphrase: *das ist so recht etwas zum Kirren*, that is just the thing to fame.—L. 107: *Grad* is Hauptmann's spelling—formerly a common spelling—for *Grat*=mountain ridge. It is not *Grad*=degree.—L. 114: *Rauzen*. I have not been able to find the word in any book at my command. It is certainly not "coined by Hauptmann." It can hardly mean "reeds." Weinhold (*Beitr.*, p. 77) has the word *Rautze*=*Verschleimung*. This word is, of course, from a different stem. It occurs

in High-German in the form *Rutze*, cf. Grimm, *D. W.*, viii, 1572. Now, by analogy to this correspondence, would it not be safe to assume that Silesian *Rauze* corresponds to the MHG. *ruzze* or *rutsche*=*Felsabhang, Kluft* (cf. Müller-Zarncke, *Mhd. Wb.*, ii, 1, pp. 824 f.; Grimm, *D. W.*, viii, 1568), or that it is connected with OHG. *ruozzan*=*die Erde aufwählen* (cf. Graff 2, 564; Schade, 732) and means "a gully"? Either meaning would give excellent sense.—L. 129: *Glockentier*. Why "monstrous bell"? It is the same personification as in l. 1269, where the note correctly gives "bell-monster."—L. 254: *erneut*. I believe the apostrophe in the original is a misprint. The word can only be past participle, just as in l. 1634.—L. 278. I cannot agree with the interpretation in the note. This line for the first time gives expression to the difference between Heinrich's life *im Menschentel* and his life with Rautendelein in the mountains. His former life now seems to Heinrich like (spiritual) death, his present condition—he thinks he is dead—like the beginning of real life. Cf. ll. 254-257.—L. 279: *Ich lebte, fiel*. The explanation in the note is not only inappropriate, but prosaic. His fall is the last event of his life which Heinrich remembers. In his feverish condition he constantly speaks of it, it weighs upon his mind. Cf. ll. 249, 261, 264, 268, 274, 279, 280. He thinks he is dead (l. 275), and now he sums up all he remembers or cares to remember about himself: I fell, I lived, I fell. Cf. l. 284.—L. 309. Grimm's third definition of *Märchen* has nothing to do with the use of the word in this line.—L. 400: *Hakengimpel* is a variety of the species finch having a hooked bill somewhat like that of the cross-bill.—L. 429: *Blaupfeifereien* are not "lightnings," but "tricks, magic, deception." Cf. Sanders, *Ergänzungswörterbuch*, p. 81.—L. 564: *Ringelreigenflüsterkranz* "has no definite signification" and "is sound with little more than suggestion?" To the German mind it is replete with meaning and with poetry; it recalls the *Ringel-Ringel-Reihe* of the round-dance of childhood and conjures up a vivid picture of mysteriously whispering elves (fairies) forming a circle as fair as a wreath of flowers (*Kranz*).—L. 900: *lebt'* is imperfect indic. and refers to the time before Heinrich had entered into Magda's life.—L. 921: *morgen* does not

mean "morning," but "to-morrow." The same inscrutable God who one day causes everything to blossom, may destroy it the next day. Cf. *Job*, 12, 23.—L. 975. The translation fails to bring out the most important point in this passage: *Geberg Glück*. In giving the world his bells Heinrich has enjoyed the highest happiness, that coming from giving. Cf. *Acts* 20, 3, and l. 1454.—L. 1064, Note: *his* should be *her*, as it refers to Magda.—L. 1216: *Wünschliche Gedanken*=*Wunschgedanken*, that is, wishes. Rautendein's wishes are supposed to have the power to cure.—L. 1275: *Schappel* is here a chaplet of metal, probably gold, a diadem, which Heinrich forges, like the *Ring und Spängelein*.—L. 1300. The use of *er* in this and the following line indicates the feeling of superiority which has come over Rautendein through her association with Heinrich. In a patronizing manner she asks the two sprites whether they have carried out her commands.—L. 1532: *einzig* is to be construed with *kann*: "I did so designate a thing which (in reality) must name itself, which alone can do so, and which claims this right and shall have it." Heinrich calls his work *ein Glockenspiel*, in the absence of a more adequate term; but his creation is to be so new and wonderful that it must name itself, as it were, no one else is able to give it the right name. Cf. note to l. 1505. The editor makes Heinrich say just about the opposite.—L. 1553: *graugedehnt* is omitted in the translation.—L. 1571. The force of *überbauscht* is not brought out. The word refers to *Scharen*. "The hosts, with silken banners rustling and swelling above them."—L. 1692: *so bin ich* is not "I am thus;" *so* is the well-known particle introducing a principal clause after a dependent clause. "But if it should happen that . . ." (l. 1687) "(then) I am—I! I know what I will, etc."—L. 1697: *grade* is not "even," but the temporal particle "just (then)." The question arises: is *sie* object or subject? Either construction is possible. But it is better to take *sie* as the accusative, and *die Dummheit*, a personified abstract noun, as the subject: "Stupidity may just be ringing it" (at the moment when I strike the bell to pieces).—L. 1795. The translation is wrong. "Sense of rest" is in German *das Gefühl der Ruhe*. *Sinn* here is "meaning, purpose."

Heinrich dislikes the twilight, because it compels him to stop working, to rest, but does not grant him sleep, and rest without sleep is to him meaningless, purposeless.—L. 1917: *ratlos* is not "restless." The editor evidently read *rastlos*!—L. 1919: *vermöchte* is subjunctive and should be translated accordingly.—L. 2013. An *Eifrer* is "a zealot," not "a more zealous man;" there is no comparative in it.—L. 2153, Stage direction. The editor does not seem to realize (cf. note to 2163) that Magda has taken her children with her to her watery grave (see l. 2488), and that it is the spirits of the children that now appear.—L. 2223. It does not seem to me a matter "of course" to make the *Hochzeit* refer to Rautendein's marriage to the Nickelmännchen. It gives much better sense if we interpret *Hochzeit* symbolically: it is the happy time spent with Heinrich. In the midst of it the gnomes bring her the fatal cup and, instead of being the bride of the man she loves, she finds herself the bride of the water-sprite.—L. 2272. *Warum nicht gar* has negative force: "I won't do anything of the kind." Nickelmännchen pretends to scorn Rautendein now that she has been deserted by her lover.—L. 2422: *Siedler* is here not "settler," but has the meaning of the more common compound *Einsiedler*.—L. 2526: *verlassen* is "deserted." As Rautendein is singing of sad things, we must think of fires lighted to celebrate some festival. Cf. note to l. 1331.

Mythology and folk-lore form an important part of the play. The editor should have treated these subjects more in connection. It is not sufficient to put down quotations from Grimm, Thorpe, or the *Encyclopedia Britannica*. Wherever the editor does not quote, he is apt to err. The statement on p. 148 that "unless the circumstances are quite unusual, the elves hold themselves aloof from mankind and are generally inimical" is not correct. The extract from Grimm's *Mythologie* cited in support of this refers to the dwarfs only, not to the whole category of elves. Cf. Grimm, *Myth.*, p. 428: *sie (elbe, nixe und kobolde) bedürfen immer der anlehnung an die menschen*; Mogk in Paul's *Grdr.* i, 1029: *Elfen in der umfassendsten Bedeutung des Wortes sind seelische Geister, die in der Natur in der Regel zum Nutzen der Menschheit wirken*.—It is

misleading in the note to l. 68 to refer to the note on *Elementargeist*; *Salamander*=*Molch* and *Salamander*=“elemental spirit” are two very different things. Cf. Grimm, *D. W.* viii, 1679, and Düntzer, *Goethes Faust*, p. 224.—L. 447. *Kielkröpfe* are not “children born unnaturally,” but, generally, the children of elfish spirits substituted for human children, changelings; or the gnomes, sprites, etc., themselves, usually misshapen, hence, in a way, “monsters.” Thus the *Schrat* is called *Kielkropf* (l. 2017). But in l. 447 *Kielkropf* is one of several diseases or deformities with which the old woman may afflict children. Adelung’s first definition of the word is: *ein Kropf an der Kehle, besonders so fern er von Kindern mit auf die Welt gebracht wird*. Hildebrand (Grimm, *D. W.*, v, 681) cannot cite any example with this meaning, but Adelung’s definition fits here perfectly. Cf. Grimm, *Myth.* i, iii, 135.—L. 1272: *Hollenzopf* is not “the cock’s comb.” It seems to be a compound of *Holle*, that is, *Frau Holle*, and *Zopf*, having the same or a similar meaning as *Drudenzopf* (l. 446). Vilmar, *Hessisches Idiotikon*, p. 173, gives the meaning *verworrener Haarzopf*. Cf. Grimm, *Myth.* i, pp. 384, 968; Mannhardt, *Germanische Mythen* (Berlin, 1858), p. 261; Schmidt, *Westerwäldisches Idiotikon*, pp. 73, 341.—L. 1327. The custom of rolling burning wheels down the hills continues to the present day. Cf. Jahn, *Deutsche Opferbräuche*, Index s. v. *Räder treiben*.—L. 2018: *So alt wie der Westerwald*, the editor says, “is an expression that occurs very frequently,” I can only find one place where it is used: Grimm’s *Kindermärchen*, Vol. i, No. 39, third tale. In the notes (Vol. iii, p. 67) Grimm does not cite any parallel passage, doubtless because he does not know any, though he cites similar phrases. I believe that Hauptmann, consciously or unconsciously, got the phrase from this tale of Grimm’s.

The lack of accuracy is not confined to the Notes, it appears also in the Introduction. The editor says (p. v): Hauptmann “was finally compelled to leave (*die Kunstschule*) because of irregular attendance. This was in 1882.” Schlenther, upon whose book the Introduction is based, relates (p. 21) that Gerhart was *ausgeschlossen* in January 1881, but after eleven

weeks was permitted to return; and that a year later, April 1882, he left the school *wegen Krankheit*.—Further on (p. ix) the editor mixes the dates of Hauptmann’s two comedies, *Der Biberpelz* and *College Crampton*. The latter appeared a year before the *Biberpelz*.

As to the method the editor should have been guided by what he says on p. ii: “the text is not likely to be placed in the hands of young students.” But the notes contain much that advanced students do not need. What is gained by translating and paraphrasing whole passages which the average Junior or Senior can work out himself? Many single words are translated which may be found in any dictionary.—Much more serious, however, are the omissions: l. 14, *Buschgrossmutter*, cf. Grimm, *Myth.* i, p. 400; l. 100: *klitzeklein*, cf. Grimm, *D. W.*, s. v. *klein*, ii, 7, and s. v. *klinzig*; l. 104, *soso lala*; l. 279, stage direction, *verfallend* (used several times); l. 435, *Peter*; l. 499 *Leichnam* (in this sense now very unusual); l. 636, *dertausend*; l. 723, *Liesch*; l. 959, a very curious construction; l. 1054, *Michelsbaude* (the explanation on p. 149 is not sufficient); l. 1083, *fackeln*, here used in a different sense from l. 2260; l. 1245, *Hornig*, evidently a woodcutter; l. 1253, *Rübekol*, cf. Grimm, *Myth.* i, p. 397; l. 1463, *Nachbar Karges Giebel*; l. 1811, *Krüppeltanne*; l. 1997, *Meister Schaum*; l. 2008, *Wanst*; l. 2016, *Kuhflatsch*; l. 2018, *Westerwald*; l. 2063, *Wasserkopf*; l. 2213, *Klirreflug*.

Many notes are repeated without any apparent reason: 68 and 623; 129 and 1269; 132 and 1272; 241 and 1380; part of 402 and part of 1253; 446 and 1658; 474 and 1042; 1773 and 2315; 1658, 1759, 1836.

Sometimes words are not commented on until they occur the second or third time: *fackeln* is translated l. 2260, but occurred in the same sense l. 1995; *itzund* is explained l. 2266, after occurring in ll. 275 (jetztund), 503, 927; similarly *Irrlicht*, l. 2343, cf. l. 2152. Why is *Amtmann* in l. 215 translated “bailiff” and in l. 792 “magistrate?”

There are not many misprints. The following two deserve notice: l. 622, read *Kafer* instead of *Küfer*, cf. the note; l. 1777 read *eins* instead of *ein*.

JOHN A. WALZ.

Western Reserve University.

ENGLISH LITERATURE.

The Mind of Tennyson. His Thoughts on God, Freedom, and Immortality. By E. HERSHEY SNEATH, Ph. D., Professor of Philosophy in Yale University. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1900. 12mo, pp. 189.

THE study of philosophy should precede and accompany advanced work in English literature. Not only is such study admirable for training in analysis and valuable for mental discipline and intellectual equipment, but it has positive usefulness. The whole subject of æsthetics, on which much of literary criticism is necessarily founded, comes under the general domain of philosophy. To study intelligently the various theories of poetry, of the drama, and even of the novel, an acquaintance with the main problems of philosophy, and with the chief modern philosophical writers, is well-nigh indispensable. Furthermore, as literature is the immortal part of history, and the interpretation of life, so a knowledge, however meagre, of the history of philosophy, which is simply the history of human thought, affords the best possible foundation for the study of the development of literary forms. Many nineteenth century writers cannot be understood in detail without some familiarity with the main ideas set forth in Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason*; and how valuable to the student of literature is an acquaintance with Schopenhauer's *World as Will and Idea*, is known only to those specialists in English who have read and pondered over that stimulating book. It is quite possible that much of our present training of graduate students in English, students who will soon be teachers, is a trifle too narrow; and nothing can broaden their views of art and life and give them what some of them seem to lack—a stock of interesting ideas—more effectively than the pursuit, as an avocation, of the highways of philosophical thought.

All his life long Tennyson was an enthusiastic student of philosophy. Although not an original thinker himself, and possessing what seems to some of us, at any rate, a rather commonplace mind, his poetry, as everyone is willing to admit, reflected with astonishing faithfulness the current thought of his age, which

means that he turned his reading to good account, and by his remarkable genius for poetic expression, transformed the dry bones of philosophy into the most beautiful living forms of verse. Therefore a study of Tennyson by a professional student of philosophy, and a study entirely from the philosophical point of view, is wholly welcome. Prof. Sneath says in his preface,

"The aim of this little book is to interpret and systematise Tennyson's thoughts on God, Freedom, and Immortality. Great care has been taken not to force the interpretation in any manner, but to determine as nearly as possible just what the poet thought on these 'inevitable questions.' To this end special effort has been made to distinguish between the subjective and objective,—the personal and impersonal,—in his poetry; also, to make due allowance for metaphor and poetic license. The interpretation has, of course, been made in the light of Tennyson's relation to the spirit of his age."

The promise made in this preface is faithfully kept, both from the positive and negative point of view. The author, with the possible exception of page 150, where he interprets part xlvii of *In Memoriam* as positive affirmation rather than mere poetic imagination, never forces Tennyson to say anything that the language of the poet does not justify: he draws theories from the language, and does not try to make the language fit the theories. This is one of the chief merits of the book. Again, Prof. Sneath sticks to his subject closely, something that all philosophical writers do not always accomplish; he is never tempted away from his subject into the enticing fields of purely literary and artistic criticism, preferring to leave that to the hundreds of books and essays where it has been and will be fully treated.

The book has a short general introduction, and is then divided into three chapters dealing with the three great affirmations of the so-called practical reason, God, Freedom, and Immortality. On these three subjects the author shows that Tennyson followed strictly the Kantian philosophy, or in other words the enlightened religious thought of the nineteenth century—that these three postulates are forever beyond the possibility of knowledge and demonstration, but are articles of faith, *noumena*, realities which transcend phenomena of sense,

and are grasped by the practical reason. Though we cannot know them, we may believe them, and Tennyson elects to do so. The objection might immediately be raised that any thoughtful reader of Tennyson would know his general position anyway, hence why write a book on the subject? If the object of Prof. Sneath's book were merely to find out the poet's ultimate religious and philosophical attitude, this objection would be valid, and the book be at once condemned as superfluous; but the author's object is to "interpret and systematise." He takes the poems in their chronological order, and clearly shows how Tennyson developed, and how different his final attitude was from his earliest position. The book may fairly be called, then, an addition to our knowledge of Tennyson's works, and is thus an important aid to students and teachers of English.

And it happily differs from many philosophical treatises in being utterly unpretentious in style. It is as free from *ex cathedra* utterances as it is from the smell of the lamp. Its method is the method of simple inquiry; nothing is taken for granted, and the separate steps by which each conclusion is reached are so evident that he who runs may read. The introduction, giving a review of the philosophical skepticism, and the doubts of the age against which Tennyson had to struggle, is a model of clearness in style and simplicity of treatment. The fact that Tennyson, who was "an artist before he was a poet," did not believe in art for art's sake, is well demonstrated. His chief aim as a poet was an ethical one, and he felt keenly the responsibility of his gift, and the necessity for making a proper use of it. Under no circumstances could such a man have remained silent on the great religious questions that interested his age; but, as Prof. Sneath points out, he was especially drawn to them by three things: his own mental struggles, which seem to have begun at the University, the scientific skepticism that was in the very atmosphere, and finally the death of his most intimate friend, Hallam.

Of the three chapters, respectively headed "God," "Freedom," "Immortality," the last is by far the most important, and shows the most originality and research. The conclu-

sions that Prof. Sneath reaches in the first two chapters we really know in advance; the poet simply took the Kantian position assumed by so many thousands who combine intelligence with devout feeling, that God and Freedom are things forever beyond the possibility of knowledge, but in practical life are postulates on which all conduct and action are founded. In the discussion on immortality, however, Prof. Sneath goes into great detail, showing a surprisingly large number of separate arguments that Tennyson advanced in support of his hope for a future life. These arguments are all drawn from statements made in the poems themselves, and are summed up on pages 175 et seq. Some lovers of the poet may quarrel with this analytic method of extracting arguments from beautiful poetry, but the results obtained are so interesting that they throw new light on the intense eagerness with which Tennyson studied this most absorbing of all questions. The author believes that the poet went through four separate phases in his attitude toward immortality. On page 111, he says:

"The history of Tennyson's mental attitude toward the question of immortality may be divided into four periods. These are quite distinguishable, both logically and chronologically. The first, may be called the period of naïve, uncritical belief, in which the poet rests in the undisturbed confidence of an inherited faith. The second, is when he awakes from the sleep of dogmatism and experiences the first rude shocks of doubt. The third, finds him engaged in a reflective consideration of the question, endeavoring to establish his faith on a rational basis in the face of his own doubts and those of his age. The fourth, finds him emerging from this long period of rational consideration, into the enjoyment of a calm and serene faith."

While opinions may differ as to the sharpness of the lines that separate these positions one from the other, the value of this division is justified by the results reached in the summing up.

Wholly apart from Tennyson's undoubted poetic genius, Prof. Sneath evidently has immense respect for him as an original thinker and philosopher. Here we differ from him. In the preface to the *Memoir* by Hallam Tennyson, a book that on the whole we found rather marred by the son's too evident desire

to represent his father as a universal genius, as for example his calm statement that Tennyson and Oliver Wendell Holmes resembled each other "especially in their humour" (ii. 323), we find perhaps the best summary of the poet's real powers;—

"If I may venture to speak of his special influence over the world, my conviction is, that its main and enduring factors are his power of expression, the perfection of his workmanship, his strong common sense, the high purport of his life and work, his humility, and his open-hearted and helpful sympathy."

Nothing is here said about his purely intellectual strength; and the fact is, that Tennyson distinctly lacked originality and power of independent thought. For that very reason, he reflected his age in a way that few poets have done. He was the mouth-piece of the Victorian period, the true representative of nineteenth century ideas, thus fulfilling one of the most important functions of a poet. We cannot help regretting that Prof. Sneath, in his great admiration for Tennyson as a thinker, should have gone so far as to treat such specimens of his work as *The Promise of May*, and *Despair*, with respect—poems that are unworthy of Tennyson or of any one else. See pages 78, 96, 88. He quotes also with apparent approval such lines as these, which, whatever they are, are something else and worse than poetry:

"I toil beneath the curse,
But, knowing not the universe,
I fear to slide from bad to worse" (page 127).

But the very fact that Tennyson himself was neither original nor profound does not militate against the value of this inquiry into his philosophical attitude. For it is really an inquiry into the attitude not of Tennyson as an individual, but as a representative of his age, our age, and, therefore, has a double value.

A few minor errors may be noticed, which can be corrected in the second edition. "The Marquis of *Queensbury*," page 94: On page 113 we read that the *Poems by Two Brothers* was published when Tennyson was fifteen years old. He was really almost eighteen. On page 133, the quotation at the top of the page is marred by the omission of the word "so" before "utterly", which occurs in the original. The volume, *Locksley Hall Sixty Years after*, etc., was not dated 1887, as is

stated on page 168, but 1886; and the title of the volume is not given with absolute exactness. We hope also that in another edition the author will remodel the first sentence in the introduction, which is inelegant, one of the very few sentences in this book which has that fault; and we would suggest that on page 5 he omit the quotation from the Memoir, "Soon after his marriage he took to reading different systems of philosophy"—one of the many examples of Hallam Tennyson's unconscious humor.

All these, however, are blemishes of the minutest kind; we are sincerely grateful for a book that is so sound, so helpful, and so excellent in method.

WILLIAM LYON PHELPS.

Yale University.

GERMAN GRAMMAR.

Lehrbuch der deutschen Sprache, by ARNOLD WERNER-SPANHOOFD, Director of German Instruction in the High Schools of Washington, D. C. Boston: D. C. Heath and Co., 1899. 8vo, xi+301 pp.

IN some respects this book is superior to any other work known to the reviewer, as an introduction to the study of German in American schools or colleges. Its rigid exclusion of everything not indispensable to the intelligent progress of the pupil renders possible an economy of space rarely attained in text-books. Nor is this economy secured at the expense of reasonable fullness of treatment, in case of subjects vitally important. The pedagogical skill of the author is shown in the choice of these themes and in the natural order in which they are developed. The most perplexing difficulties encountered by the student are explained first, and all others are left for later discussion in the order of their diminishing importance. Not, therefore, the nature of the subject-matter, but the needs of the acquiring mind determine the arrangement of the book. Another commendable feature is an abundance of well chosen and skilfully arranged exercises, which introduce the learner gradually to the spirit of the language through reading, asking and answering questions in German, and translating from English into German.

Thirty-five lessons constitute the substance of the work. Each begins with a Development Lesson, by means of which the principles chosen for presentation are elucidated and emphasized. Then follows a Reading Lesson, at first very brief and consisting of a few German proverbs, later on extended so as to include anecdotes, fables, and short stories. This is succeeded by a Grammar lesson, in which the principles embodied in the Development Lesson are clearly stated. The author explains in the Preface (p. v) that he has used English in this part of the lesson "to overcome all difficulties the pupil may encounter in his home study." He adds, however, what seems to me sound doctrine, that "in class the rules should all be developed in German." This "however" is recommended by the notorious fact that memorizing the rules of German grammar, clothed in the student's vernacular, yields more parrot-like glibness of statement than real *Sprachgefühl*. The final Exercises of each lesson, which serve as a practical application of the principles just discovered and stated, are preceded by a Vocabulary of new words. These vocabularies are wisely selected and include, for the most part, only those root words and their more usual compounds that are in constant use in simple German prose. And the author has taken pains to use repeatedly each new word introduced, so as to facilitate the acquirement of vocabulary by association of ideas. Baumbach's little story *Der Goldbaum* is added (pp. 234f.), to serve as further reading-matter for those able to advance during the year beyond the limits of the thirty-five lessons, or as the basis of a general review.

In the Introduction (§ 6, g) *alles* should be included in the list of common words followed by adjectives beginning with capitals. The difficult matter of pronunciation is presented (pp. 3-11) without recourse to phonetic transcription, and with an apparent disregard of the excellent treatise of Hempl (German Orthography and Phonology) that seriously impairs the value of the chapter. English alphabetic signs are at best but a very imperfect means of representing German speech-sounds, and I doubt the utility of the traditional efforts in this direction of English and American writers of German grammars. Even when made by

men equally well acquainted with the sound values of German and English speech, they are ambiguous or positively misleading. So, for instance, the representation of German *ē* by the symbol (*ey*) of the English open vowel sound in *they* (cf. Introd., § 10) is very inaccurate.—Final *-er* is in English the sign of a sound varying in different parts of this country to such an extent as to render it unfit for use to suggest the sound value of German final *-e* (cf. *ibid.*)—German *ō* is not identical with English *ō* in *note*, either in point of articulation or of rounding. To assert this (cf. *ibid.*) renders the *viva voce* instruction of the teacher more difficult than it would be in the absence of any printed statement touching the point.—Worse than the inaccuracy in the case of *ō* is the use of English *not* (cf. *ibid.*) to suggest the value of German *ō* in *Otto*.—English *ā* in *late* is a closed sound and hence unsuitable to indicate the pronunciation of German *ā* in *Dänemark* (cf. *ibid.*)—The words: *has no sound of its own*, applied by the author to German *y* (cf. *ibid.*), are confusing.—The statement (Introd., § 12): "Double consonants are pronounced like the corresponding single ones" needs to be supplemented for English-speaking learners by a caution against lengthening the consonantal sound as in English (cf. Hempl, *l. c.*, § 166, e).—The indication of the pronunciation of German *g* (Introd., § 15) is incomplete, since it omits all mention of medial *g*.—The remark upon the difference between German and English *l* (cf. *ibid.*), is phonetically incomplete.—The statement (*ibid.*), "*g=k* in *keel*; always followed by *u*" needs a foot-note on the value of the following *u* (cf. Hempl, *l. c.*, § 239, 2).—"(*German*) *w*=(*English*) *w* in *winter*; after *sch*" is a misleading statement (cf. *ibid.*)—Final *ng* is pronounced in the larger part of Germany, not like *nk* in *sank*, but like English *ng* in *song* (cf. Hempl, *l. c.*, § 209, N. 3). The statement of Spanhoofd (Introd., § 17) is, therefore, too dogmatic.

An admirable feature of the book is the series of concise foot-notes which convey information and warnings at just those points where they are needed. Such a note at the bottom of page 16, emphasizing the need of learning the definite article as an organic part of each substantive, would to my mind be desirable.

—Note 1, p. 18, would be more helpful if given in connection with the vocabulary on page 17. —After the word *singular*, page 28, at the bottom, there should be a period. —Paragraph 27 (p. 34) should be supplemented by a foot-note calling attention to the common contractions *mir's*, *dir's*, *ihr's* and *sich's*. —The *Sprichwort* at the top of page 38 should be reversed, so as to retain the climax intended: *Reden ist Silber, Schweigen ist Gold*. —Paragraph 40 (p. 44) is too sweeping (cf. *der Regen*, and others). —Foot-note 3, p. 46, should explain the difference between *an einem Fluss* and *auf einem Fluss*. —Note 1, p. 57, fails to mention the reciprocal form *einander*. —The verb *wohnen*, applied to animals, suggests the style of the fable. *Leben* or *hausen* is much more usual (cf. pp. 77 f.). —In note 2, p. 87, the preposition *with* should take the place of the semicolon. —A foot-note on page 97 emphasizing the shortness of the final syllable of *April*, as if the word were spelled *Aprill*, would be desirable. —More idiomatic than "ein männliches Wort *in* -er" (p. 100) is "ein männliches Wort *auf* -er." We say in German: *Das Wort lautet auf* (rarely, *in*) *t aus*. —A few infelicitous English expressions occur, like 'as the only form in German of questions' (p. 103) and 'The participles are almost entirely used as adjectives in German' (p. 130, N. 1). —On pages 114 and 178 *nach der Schule gehen* is used apparently in place of the more usual *in die (zur) Schule gehen*. A parent, desirous of consulting the teacher, would naturally announce his intention of going to the school for this purpose by the words: *Ich will einmal nach der Schule gehen*; but the use of this idiom for 'attend (go to) school, is at present only dialectic. —When *Ort* means 'place' or 'spot', the preposition accompanying it is usually *an* (not *in*). This does not appear clearly in the statement on page 115, l. 8. —The forms *mit demselben* (*derselben*) should not be given (p. 116) as equivalents of *damit*, with no comment upon the stylistic difference between the former and the latter. —There is nothing in connection with the definition: *der Mund*, -e, 'mouth' (Vocab., p. 120), to show the beginner that the plural of *Mund* is one of the rarest plural forms in the language. —The English sentence (p. 122): "Since when is he here in town?" is a Germanism. —Note 2, p. 127, is

misleading, since it implies identity of formation in the cases of *das Weite*, *die Höhe*, and *die Länge*. —In the vocabulary, under *zufrieren* (p. 128), the common meaning 'freeze over' might well be added. —On page 131 and later, *derjenige* (*die*-, *das*-) is used as antecedent of a relative, with no mention of the equally correct and briefer *der* (*die*, *das*). —Note 1, p. 140, concerning the use of *wenn*, should be modified so as to include the past as well as the present and the future. —A more accurate locution than "while another action took place" (p. 144, l. 20) would be "before another action took place." —Note 1, p. 145, would be more helpful if sufficiently full to explain under what circumstances the German perfect represents the English imperfect. —The author shows a preference for the relative *welcher* (-e, -es) in place of the shorter and more popular *der* (*die*, *das*), which, in connection with the already mentioned free use of *derjenige*, imparts to his German style an undesirable heaviness (cf. Hermann Wunderlich: *Der deutsche Satzbau*, pp. 197 f., and *Unsere Umgangssprache*, p. 254). —Note 5, p. 174: "*gülden* (=golden), instead of *güldenes*," leaves the beginner in doubt as to whether *güldenes* or *goldenes* is the normal form. —The expression (p. 179) *Zeitwörter welche eine Veränderung des Zustandes bezeichnen* would be more accurate if the word *Zeitwörter* were modified by the adjective *intransitive*. —*ekelten sich davor* (p. 191, N. 6) means in this context, not 'loathed' but 'were nauseated at'. —*Darauf* is not the contraction but simply the union of the preposition *auf* with the adverb *da(r)* (p. 194, N. 3).

Page 196 contains the traditional paradigms of the subjunctive of the verbs *haben*, *sein*, *werden*, *hören* and *sehen*. The pupil is warned neither here nor elsewhere (cf. pp. 210 f.) in the book of the glaring discrepancy between actual speech-usage and these paradigms. It is only fair to state that this is in line with the practice of most authors of German grammars at home and abroad. Yet the present subjunctive of *haben*, save in its relatively rare use as optative or concessive in principal clauses, is not *habe*, *habest*, *habe*, *haben*, *habet*, *haben*, but *hätte*, *habest*, *habe*, (less elegantly, *hätte*,) *hätten*, *hättet*, *hätten*. Similarly the prevailing present subjunctive of *werden* is *würde*, *werdest*, *werde*,

würden, würdet, würden,—of hören: hörte, hörtest, höre (less elegantly, hörte,) hörten, hörtest, hörten,—and of sehen: sähe, sehest, sehe, sähen, sähet, sähen. For the English: 'He declares I have money about me' we speak and write: *Er behauptet, ich hätte* (not *habe*, if we wish to imply the falseness of the statement) *Geld bei mir*. 'They maintain I am growing bald'—*Man behauptet, ich würde kahl*, etc. The reason of this transfer of present meaning to preterite forms was apparently, at first, the instinctive wish to distinguish the subjunctive from the corresponding indicative inflection, as far as possible. This has led, however, to such a wide substitution of preterite for present subjunctive forms, that the former are by analogy quite generally preferred to the latter, even when, as in case of weak verbs, no inflectional distinction is thus attained (cf. *hörten, hörtest, hörten*). The use of *haben* and *werden* as auxiliaries carries the discrepancy just noted over into the paradigms of the compound tenses of all verbs. Among several correct observations of language phenomena, hidden in a large mass of dogmatism, Gustav Wustmann emphasized this matter in his much-derided *Allerhand Sprachdummheiten*, pp. 177f. Since paradigms are merely reflections of inflectional usage, authors of text-books for teaching strictly modern German ought to adjust the normal paradigm of the subjunctive to current usage, and to print displaced forms in parentheses. A foot-note should then be added to explain the situation.

A parenthetical 'pelt' after 'throw' (p. 206, N. 1) would help the American student to realize the force of the idiom: 'throw the dog with stones'.—A discussion of the various meanings of the prefixes and suffixes mentioned in §§ 160 and 161 would enhance the value of Lesson 35 (pp. 226f.).—The great importance of teaching pupils to depend for mastery of German declension, not upon the systematic classification of German substantives, but upon personal observation of actual usage, makes me regret the omission of all genitive endings from the general vocabulary at the end of the book.

However, my strictures touch matters of minor importance, for the most part, and I conclude by expressing hearty approval of the book as a valuable contribution to the helps available for effective elementary German instruction.

STARR WILLARD CUTTING.
University of Chicago.

ITALIAN LANGUAGE.

Alliteration in Italian, by ROBERT LONGLEY TAYLOR. Dissertation presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of Yale University upon application for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. New Haven: 1900. 8vo, pp. xv+151.

IN his recently published dissertation, Dr. Taylor has gone further than any preceding investigator into the subject of Alliteration in Italian; indeed, aside from Kriete's work,¹ it is the only general study of the subject. Dr. Taylor has made a careful and apparently accurate examination of some twenty-seven of the greater Italian poets, and gives us the results of his study in a table of percentage of alliteration, accompanied by a comparative chart (cf. p. 80), and followed by a list of examples. The authors of the list are well chosen, but it does seem unfortunate that the dramatic poets should be wholly left out of consideration, so that names such as those of Guarini and Maffei do not appear at all. Had dramatic poetry been included nothing would have been left to do in the subject.

Taking up the dissertation in detail, we first come to the Bibliography, which is strictly confined to works treating wholly or partially of alliteration and versification. It seems complete except for the omission of Biadene's work, quoted on p. 2, n. 1, and some half-dozen times on pp. 6-7, as *Morf. del Sonet*. All historical works, such as Gaspary's *Storia della Letteratura Italiana*, are omitted from the Bibliography, though referred to extensively in the text under more or less questionable abbreviations.

Following the Bibliography comes a list of Texts used with Abbreviations, which contains the works on which the author has drawn for his examples of alliteration. Some of the abbreviations here, too, read curiously; for example, there seems to be no good reason for abbreviating *Orlando Furioso* into *Orl. Fu.* if it is to be twice shortened (on p. 14) into *Or. Fu.* Again, *Società Tipografica della Letteratura Italiana* is abbreviated as *Soc. Tip. d. Class. It.*, though on p. 11 is given the more natural form *Soc. Tip. de. Let. It.* The question of abbreviations is no easy one at best, and in case an author does not care to follow the set

¹ *Die Alliteration in der italienischen Sprache bis Torguato Tasso*, Halle, 1893.

forms of the *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, or of some periodical of similar standing, it would seem wise at least to make the abbreviations uniform, even though the differences be as trifling as in Dr. Taylor's threefold method of shortening *Abhandlungen* (cf. pp. xi, and 52).

The body of the text is divided into five sections which we may consider in order.

I. *Definition of Alliteration.* Before giving his working definition of alliteration, the author proceeds to eliminate three forms similar to alliteration, yet which cannot be treated simply as such. These are *replicacio*, the repetition of the same word or of the same root; *geminatio*, the repetition of a word juxtaposed; and *jeu de mots* or *Spielerei*, an excessive use of the same word or letter, either in *tautogramme verses*, where every word begins with the same letter, or in *asticcio*, the employment in the interior of the line of a word equivocal with the end of the line, or in *bisticcio*, the assemblage of expressions which differ only by one vowel or two. The foregoing are Dr. Taylor's definitions. As a general definition of alliteration the writer decides for that of Giovanni Pontano, given in the latter part of the fifteenth century, and which he quotes as follows:

"Fit alliteratio quoties dictiones continuatæ vel binæ vel ternæ ab iisdem primis consonantibus, mutatis aliquando vocalibus, aut ab iisdem incipiunt syllabis, aut ab iisdem primis vocalibus" (cf. p. 8).

This definition, though so early given, has not been wholly observed by investigators, some of whom have declared for *strict* alliteration simply, which the author clearly defines as follows:

"as to form, strict alliteration in Italian is the repetition of a sound or sounds at the beginning of coördinated similar parts of speech, and . . . it reaches its highest development when such sound or sounds fall at the beginning of the tonic syllable" (cf. pp. 10-11).

The present investigator, however, while acknowledging the greater importance of strict alliteration, has chosen to follow Pontano's definition, and in so doing has treated all alliteration other than strict alliteration as *loose*. Under this heading is to be included allitera-

tions where one of the parts is a proclitic, attached to the word by abbreviation, as in the group *s'apprappa: sale*. It might be remarked that in five of the eight examples cited (cf. p. 15) both parts of the alliteration begin with the attached particles. Contrary to this phenomenon, a prefix alliteration is not to be considered valid unless accompanied by a stem alliteration. The section of definition concludes with statements regarding the joining of alliterative members by asyndeton or by conjunctive words, and of the division of members according to their meaning into synonymous, antithetic, and synthetic classes.

II. *Unavoidable and Willed Alliterations.* Under this head there are first treated those alliterations wherein the author was forced to use the alliterating words by the nature of his subject matter, as in *poesie: prose*. In considering the question of avoidable or unnecessary alliterations, the first question that arises is whether the poet intended the alliteration or whether it was clearly accidental. It is very difficult to absolutely distinguish one case from the other; for example, many unwilling alliterations can be found by comparing the expressions containing them with expressions in other languages expressing the same idea without alliteration, as *va e viene* by the side of *come and go*, it is especially in such popular formulas that the alliteration is mechanical and not intentional. The question could only be finally solved by the finding of a manuscript wherein the poet has erased a word in order to insert another to produce alliteration. The author grants that this method is impossible, but he says we may be sure of intended alliteration when an alliterative expression is found to have been copied from some similar expression in the preceding literature, or when one poet has reworked the verse of another with increase in the proportion of alliteration. As an example of the latter, Dr. Taylor gives us the results of his examination of Berni's *rifacimento* of the *Orlando Innamorato* of Boiardo, showing that Berni has rejected eight of Boiardo's eighteen alliterative formulas, but in their place has introduced fourteen new ones, all of which must be considered as willed alliterations. All of the cases in the work of the two poets are cited in full (cf. pp. 28-29).

The psychological student alone can finally decide the question of willed alliteration as it stands, and Dr. Taylor gives some valuable suggestions from this standpoint, which tend in the main to show that in such a study as the present dissertation all alliteration must be considered as willed unless there is direct proof to the contrary.

III. *Stock Alliterations.* Here, in the first place, is given a list of forty-six Italian alliterations for which the author has found Latin parallels. The examples are neatly grouped together in alphabetical order, both the Latin and the Italian being given. The Latin formulas are taken from the work of previous investigators. There follows this a list of well-known and popular alliterations; the first part contains some ten or fifteen loose alliterations, taken from Giusti's *Proverbi Toscani*, then comes a list of eighty-six popular alliterations taken from various sources, and grouped alphabetically.

IV. *Alliteration and the Artistic Poets.* This is perhaps the most interesting portion of the whole dissertation, for in it is taken up the relative use of alliteration by the greatest poets of Italy. Following the author's discussion we first see that the *Sicilian School* did not follow its Provençal progenitors in their frequent employment of alliteration (of which twenty-eight examples are cited on pp. 53-55). Ciulo d'Alcamo offers no good instance of alliteration, and there are scarcely more than a half-dozen examples in the work of the whole school; after them Guittone d'Arezzo bridges over the gap to Dante with some twelve alliterative expressions. Dante's work, with propriety, has been especially searched for examples of alliteration, with the result that Dr. Taylor has tabulated seventeen examples of loose alliteration, twenty-three of *replicacio*, ten of repetition at the beginning of lines, eight of *geminatio*, and four of *figura etymologica* (not elsewhere referred to); these examples he follows with an alphabetical list of alliterating nouns, adjectives, verbs, adverbs, prepositions, and pronouns, in all a hundred and four cases, the general average of alliteration for Dante being one case in a hundred and twenty lines, or .78 per cent. Passing to Petrarch and Boccaccio, we find the greatest employer of allit-

eration and the least. Petrarch's examples of alliteration average one to every seventy-one lines, or 1.40 per cent, while Boccaccio's are in the proportion of one in six hundred and twenty-one lines, or .10 per cent. After these two authors comes Pulci with an average of .39 per cent, followed by Boiardo with .39 per cent, and Ariosto with .68 per cent. Tasso increases the use of alliteration to 1.09 per cent. After him in the lesser poets of the sixteenth century the percentage of alliterative verses is .90 per cent. The seventeenth century presents almost as great a contrast as the fourteenth, with Marini's average of 1.35 per cent followed by that of Chiabrera which is .39 per cent. Since Marini there has been a general decrease in the use of alliteration, and with one or two exceptions the average has been between .40 and .70 per cent; Carducci and Aleardi, the last two poets treated, having .50 per cent and .42 per cent respectively. The discussion ends with a table of the percentage of alliteration used by the twenty-seven authors examined, from Dante to Aleardi, and facing the same page the results are exhibited on a very neat chart. There we see standing out the names of the chief employers of alliteration, Petrarch, Baldi, Marini, Filicaja, and Metastasio; while at the bottom can be seen those authors who were less favorable to its use, Boccaccio, Pulci, Chiabrera, Gozzi, and Leopardi. The line for Chiabrera should be carried down to the .39 per cent line.

V. *Alphabetical List of Examples.* In the final division of the dissertation are grouped together very complete lists of Italian alliterations, together with citations of the places where they are found, those cited earlier being omitted. In all there are seven hundred and two instances, divided as follows: nouns, four hundred and three; adjectives, one hundred and fifty-nine; verbs, one hundred and forty.

The neatness of the printing and publication deserve praise generally, though the proof has been rather carelessly read in places. Besides the omission of several commas and periods, the following points have been noted. P. ix, l. 34, should read *lateinischen*; p. xv, ll. 2, 3, *Triomfo* is usually spelled with an *n*; l. 5, should read *Morgante*; l. 19, should read *Gerusalemme*; l. 27, should read *Machiavelli*;

l. 31, should read *Filippo*; l. 34, should read *Giotto*; p. 1, ll. 11-12, *che'l* should not be divided; p. 2, n. 1, *École des Chartes* should be capitalized; p. 3, n. 1, italicize *replicacio*; p. 12, ll. 20-21, *campagna* should be divided *cam-pagna*, hence there is no syllable *pagn*; p. 13, l. 3, *campania* should be divided *cam-pa-ni-a*; p. 30, n. 1, should read *Leipsic* or *Leipzig*.

MURRAY P. BRUSH.

Johns Hopkins University.

GERMAN LITERATURE.

Auswahl aus Luthers deutschen Schriften.

Edited with Introduction and Notes by W. H. CARRUTH, Ph. D. Boston: Ginn and Co., 1899. 12mo, lxxxii+362 pp.

THERE are many reasons for studying the works of Luther. He is not only a great national hero, but he has much significance in a new era in human existence. He is not only an embodiment of national character, but he holds a unique position in relation to the regeneration of a national language and literature. Up to the present time there has been in this country no satisfactory book for the study of Luther on the literary and linguistic side. Prof. Carruth's edition has been prepared with the idea of awakening a desire to know more about these features of the works of this most energetic man, and it will certainly accomplish this purpose. As Luther's writings have interest for students of history, of sociology, of theology, and of literature, Prof. Carruth has made his selections with intent to slight none of these subjects, but has, nevertheless, very properly given preference to history and literature. Keeping in mind the needs of college students, he has made extracts from the writings of intrinsic or historical worth covering the whole course of Luther's life, and has given enough of each of the greatest works to present an outline of it.

The editor has exhibited much care and good judgment in making these selections. The longest one, fifty-nine pages, is from *An*

den Adel, which is universally regarded as one of Luther's most important writings. There are about fourteen pages from *Ein Sermon dass man Kinder zur Schule halten solle*. This is justly called "one of the best arguments ever written for free public schools, urging that girls as well as boys need good training." Of *Geistliche Lieder* there are about twenty pages, and thirty from *An die Radherrn*.

In view of the deserved strictures (Introduction, p. xi) that Prof. Carruth puts on Jacob Grimm's famous statement concerning Luther's services to New High German, and on the exaggeration of which this dictum has been the cause, it seems a bit inconsistent to quote the statement on the title-page, where it appears as a kind of motto, as a thesis to be defended.

Early in the Introduction (pp. xv-xvi) the editor discusses the principal characteristics of Luther's style; he refers to the matter again later (pp. lxiv-lxv), quoting Luther's own opinion of his style. It would not do violence to the chronological arrangement of the biographical part to unite these two discussions. Students will incidentally be interested in comparing Heine's opinion of Luther's style, and also Scherer's, with that of Luther himself.

Sixty-seven pages of the Introduction are devoted to "Luther's literary biography," which is a "running account of his literary labors." The references are to the Weimar edition, so far as that is possible; but for the works that have not yet appeared in that edition, references are given to the Erlangen edition, with now and then a reference to other editions. I am inclined to believe that this part of the Introduction contains more material than is really necessary for the class of students for whom the book is intended. Very few will have time to enter into such details as are here presented. Still, all this information gives increased value to the work for the few, especially since not all may have access elsewhere to the material. It shows evidence of much scholarly searching and sifting.

There are some infelicities in sentence-structure and expression, which the editor, whose style is usually above reproach, will surely improve in a revision; for instance,

"While preaching on the Ten Commandments in 1516, and on the Lord's Prayer in 1517, both sermons printed early in 1518, Luther had already been stirred by the evils of the sale of indulgences" (p. xviii);

"At the same time Luther gave out in German a *Taufbüchlein*" (p. xl). Is not "gave out" the result of German influence? The frequent repetition of such expressions as "other publications of the year 1529 are," and "among other publications of 1525 are," becomes monotonous. This lack of variety of phraseology is perhaps unavoidable, and doubtless due to the character of this part of the Introduction, which assumes a catalogue style, for the works of each year are here enumerated and characterized.

The text is not "normalized" but has been "rationalized" by removing from it "all arbitrary and meaningless hindrances to easy reading." In taking liberties with the text, Prof. Carruth very wisely does not go as far as Goedeke and Neubauer; he changes nothing that could be essential to a study, not strictly scientific, of the phonology, inflection, syntax, or vocabulary of the language, with the expressed hope that the book may be found useful in a study of Luther's language and style. Among the principles (Introduction, pp. x-xi) that have guided the editor in "rationalizing" the text are: capitalization according to Prussian rules; punctuation as nearly rational as possible; omission of all doublets and triplets, except where there are reasons for thinking that the original orthography represented a different sound; omission of *c* before *k* and after *l*, *r*, *n*, and of *t* or *c* with *z*; *j* for *i*, where consonantal, and *i* for *j*, when vocalic; *i* for *y*; *s* for *ss* or *sz*, where there is but a single *s* in the present spelling.

Where the text has been abbreviated, the fact is made known by such expressions as, "Out 22 lines," "Out 3½ pages," "50 lines out." These sound very much like instructions to the printer, and some better expression might have been found to indicate omissions.

Immediately following the text there is a "prefatory note" of three pages which is intended to prepare the student for the peculiarities of Luther's language. The deviations of

his language from Modern German are discussed under six heads: Vowels, Consonants, Inflections, Contractions, Word-Formation, and Syntax. The help here given will be found very useful toward assisting the student to *orientieren* himself, and, as the editor remarks, he will soon observe that Luther's own usage is not consistent in these matters.

The Notes consist largely of translations into Modern German or English (a German periodical has called them a *Vocabularium*); in the absence of a complete Luther Dictionary, that is perhaps inevitable, but at the same time many of the translations seem unnecessary. For instance, most students into whose hands this book is likely to come will not need the help given in the following: P. 176, l. 16, *dass=so dass*; p. 182, l. 2, *deutsch=auf Deutsch*; p. 184, l. 25, *des=dessen*; p. 187, l. 7, *bas=besser*; p. 206, l. 9, *der=dieser*; p. 235, l. 8, *unbegreiflich=unbegreifbar*; p. 293, l. 25, *Odem=Atem*; p. 299, l. 8, *die Zeit uber*, 'throughout the time'. By omitting such notes as these much valuable space might be saved. Of repeated notes the following were noticed: P. 4, l. 23, "*Gang=geh*", from the parallel stem now found only in *gegangen*" (the editor should also have mentioned the preterite, *ging* etc.) "and in *Gang*," repeated under p. 27, l. 6; p. 22, l. 20, *schweig=geschweige*, repeated under p. 176, l. 9; p. 35, l. 2, *find=findet*, repeated under p. 156, l. 22. In the note to p. 19, l. 21, it is explained that *on* means *ohne*; this explanation should have been given in the note to p. 2, where *on* appears for the first time, and then in four consecutive lines.

The following misprints have been noted: In the note to p. 3, l. 24, for *Pref. Note D 21* read *Pref. Note D 2*; on p. 350, the reference under the title should read, *See Introd., lxiii*.

In the Preface the editor expresses the hope that criticism may help to free a second edition from errors. I have not discussed the many excellent qualities of this work; they so outweigh all others that they speak for themselves. I have simply endeavored to draw attention to a few points in which a good book can be made a better book.

CHARLES BUNDY WILSON.

University of Iowa.

GERMAN LITERATURE.

Gellerts Lustspiele. Ein Beitrag zur deutschen Litteraturgeschichte des 18. Jahrhunderts, von Dr. PHIL. WOLD. HAYNEL. Emden und Borkum, 1896. 8vo, viii+87 pp.

Gellerts Lustspiele. Ein Beitrag zur Entwicklungsgeschichte des deutschen Lustspiels, von JOHANNES COYM. Berlin, 1899. 8vo, viii+91. pp. (*Palæstra: Untersuchungen und Texte aus der deutschen und englischen Philologie*, herausgegeben von Alois Brandl und Erich Schmidt. ii.)

BOTH volumes are doctor dissertations treating of the technique and the language of Gellert's three comedies and his one *Nachspiel*, and establishing the origin of the characters contained in their casts.

One of Gellert's merits is to have introduced the *comédie larmoyante* in German literature, imitating in this the French development of the stage. Together with this French influence goes the adaptation to the German stage of a certain number of types of character, which can be also found in Holberg's and Frau Gottsched's plays, and whose origin can be traced back to both English and French sources, as contained in periodicals like the *Tatler*, the *Spectator*, and their continental imitations, in La Bruyère's *Caractères*, and in comedies of Molière, Destouches, Nivelle de la Chaussée, and others. Haynel in his volume makes an attempt to enumerate those types which are predominant in *Gellerts Lustspiele*, and adds to them a list of some of the traditional plots, accidents, intrigues and denouements of that time. Both authors however merely carry out and complete the excellent indications given by Erich Schmidt in his sketch of Gellert's character and writings in the *Allgemeine deutsche Bibliothek*.

The examination of Gellert's technique and style follows closely Erich Schmidts statement's in a review published in the *Anzeiger für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Litteratur* ii, pp. 38-79. Its chief result is the proof of the fact that Gellert uses almost the same technique and language in his *Fabeln* and in his *Lustspiele*. The chapters on Gellert's language in both volumes, however, do not exhaust their subject.

As early as 1876, in the review just quoted, Erich Schmidt showed the urgent need of a history of style in German literature, and brilliantly indicated on what lines it should be written. But to the present day not much advance has been made in this matter, and it is more desirable than ever that a thorough investigation should be devoted to the development of German literary style, demonstrating on a psychological and grammatical basis the close connection of any habit of thought with its characteristic expression in the choice of style.¹

ALBERT HAAS.

Bryn Mawr College.

CORRESPONDENCE.

UNIVERSITY EXTENSION IN DANISH.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—Ever since the introduction of the English system of University Extension into Denmark a few years ago Danish writers have, consciously or unconsciously, been experimenting with various methods of naming the movement. It is obvious that there are three main methods of nomenclature to choose from; the English word can be taken in unchanged, a Danish word may be used describing the system from a different point of view, or the English word may be literally translated into Danish.

The first method has been used so generally in connection with sporting terms that it has at least the virtue of precedent. Its use was noted in a letter from Oxford, published in a recent number of the *Berlingske Tidende*, the leading Copenhagen newspaper. It is in recognized use, but perhaps more frequently in connection with the English original than with its Danish imitation.

An example of the second method is found in the term *Folkeuniversitet*, which occurs in the *Berlingske Tidende* for December 9th,

¹ Cf. the admirable discussion in Konrad Burdach's *Reinmar der Alte und Walther von der Vogelweide*, pp. 55 ff.

1898. At about the same time the word was used in a Danish weekly newspaper with the English word in parenthesis, showing that at that time the English word was more familiar in that meaning than its Danish equivalent. Although this word is inferior to the English form, it is certainly to be preferred to the ponderous *Folkeuniversitetsundervisning*, (People's University Instruction) which occurs in the *Berlingske* a month earlier, or to *Folkeuniversitetsforening*, (People's University Union) which is apparently the latest addition to the verbal collection. All three are misleading, as they imply a new kind of university, not an extension of the university system already in existence. Finally we may note *Bevægelse for Folkets Oplysning* (Movement for the Enlightenment of the People), but this term, one is almost tempted to say sentence, is a description rather than a name. It is too clumsy for any but German ears.

Finally the third method, that of literal translation, has been employed, for the first time, so far as was noted, by the Norwegian-American newspaper *Amerika*. The word is *Universitetsudvidelse*, and it seems to possess the three main conditions of naturalization; it is Danish, it is descriptive, and it corresponds exactly to the English word for which it stands. It is not at all improbable, however, that the present tendency to use English loan words in Danish to designate English ideas will give the final victory to University Extension.

DANIEL KILHAM DODGE.

University of Illinois.

ELECTIVE COURSES.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—Is there any 'English' phrase for "Elective Courses," an expression so familiar to American youth? To judge by the following passages in the London *Athenæum* of Sept. 2, 1899, the term is strange to English ears:

"This interesting study in literary evolution is of American provenance, and first took shape as 'a series of lectures given in elective courses'—whatever those may be—in Yale College."

It is clear that American institutions should

be named by a Committee of Englishmen if we wish to prevent inter-Anglosaxonian misunderstandings.

ANDREW INGRAHAM.

Swain Free School,
New Bedford, Mass.

GRETCHEN'S CONSCIENCE.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—Although agreeing in the main with the spirit of Prof. Eggert's views in the April number of this journal, I feel that there are some points in his article that would need careful consideration before their acceptance as proof of the soundness of the argument that the *Böse Geist* in the Cathedral scene in *Faust* represents more than the voice of Gretchen's conscience. Without desiring to enter into a controversy, I wish to call attention to the matters that should be weighed.

After declaring himself in harmony with the opinion held by the great majority of *Faust* scholars, the defence of which was the purpose of my article in the January number, Prof. Eggert says:

"The question may, however, be raised: was it the poet's intention to represent only her conscience? It would seem that the *Böse Geist* is an impersonation in the same sense that the *Erdgeist* is. We must, therefore, attribute to him a certain character. As the equivalent of Gretchen's conscience the conception would be merely allegorical. But Goethe shuns allegories as frigid,—with him everything becomes concrete, plastic, tangible."

In the first place, the entire situation in the *Erdgeist* scene is radically different from that in the Cathedral scene, and consequently there can be no comparison between them. In the sense in which Professor Eggert looks at the matter, Mephistopheles too is allegorical, as embodying "all that is negative, sceptical, indifferent, and flippant in human nature." His argument on this point is about as follows:

"If the *Geist* means simply the voice of Gretchen's conscience, the conception is allegorical, but since Goethe shunned allegory, this can not be."

That in itself is not a conclusive argument against such an interpretation, for Goethe did

not always avoid allegory. Though recent scholarship tells us that we must impute no allegorical meaning to certain scenes in Faust, and that we should, for example, regard the *Mütter* as a myth and not as an allegory, this teaching does not, of course, preclude the possibility of the presence of allegory in the drama. Moreover, the poet himself has confessed to the use of it in this work. When, in 1829, he and Eckermann were discussing the possibility of representing the *Mummenschanz* scene, Goethe evidently agreed with the latter's remark:

"Es ist doch eine Allegorie wie sie nicht leicht besser existiren möchte."¹

The conversation then turned to the identity of the Boy Charioteer with Euphorion, and Goethe said, according to Eckermann:

"Der Euphorion ist kein menschliches, sondern nur ein allegorisches Wesen. Es ist in ihm die *Poesie* personificirt, die an keine Zeit, an keinen Ort und an keine Person gebunden ist."²

Prof. Eggert contends that the religious views that Gretchen's education had inculcated in her are also embodied in the *Böse Geist*. That is true so far as they were intended to guide and regulate conscience; they thus become a part of conscience, and so we get back to the same point, and our difference of opinion might be reduced to a difference in definition of conscience. The poet is charged, though, with committing "an artistic mistake," if he intended the *Böse Geist* only as the voice of conscience, for allowing the scene to take place in the cathedral and not in the privacy of her chamber. But the church is the place best calculated to arouse the voice of conscience, particularly in a person of Gretchen's faith, as Prof. Eggert's argument itself implies, when it makes the *Geist* reflect the training that she has received from the Church.

The further statement is made that Goethe evidently felt that he needed to give, at least in one scene, an outward form to the imaginary 'fiend' or 'tormentor' in whose existence Gretchen firmly believes, and, for this reason, he chose the *Geist* and the Cathedral scene.

¹ Eckermann, *Gespräche mit Goethe*. Leipzig, 1885, ii, p. 108.

² *Ibidem*, p. 109.

Why give an outward form to the 'tormentor' in this scene? Why not everywhere, if at all? And, on the other hand, it is not reasonable to suppose that the *Geist* was intended to represent two things so totally different as Gretchen's conscience and the Devil.

CHARLES BUNDY WILSON.

University of Iowa.

With *sory* grace, AND SIMILAR FORMS OF IMPRECATION IN CHAUCER.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—We beg to call attention to a certain group of expressions which, in our experience, are commonly misunderstood by students of Chaucer, or not understood at all. Yet—as far as we can see—commentators are usually silent about them. Moreover, the evidence of erroneous rendering or imperfect punctuation shows that editors and translators have stumbled over them only too frequently.

Perhaps a simple reference to Tyrwhitt, that old Chaucer expert, might settle the whole matter. But since the information on the point in question vouchsafed by the two most modern editors, Skeat and Pollard, is, in many cases, either inadequate (if not altogether lacking) or directly misleading, it may not be otiose to present here the phrases concerned, together with a brief comment.

1. *The proudest of thise ryotours three*
Answerde agayn, "what?" carl, with sory grace,
Why artow al forwrapped save thy face?

C. 716 (*Pard. T.*).

Saunders, in his semi-modernized version, has: 'What! churl with sorry cheer!' Von Düring translates:

'Warum, bis auf dein trauriges Gesicht,
 Verhüllst Du, Schuft, Dir Deinen Leib so dicht?'

2. *And whan this ryotour, with sory grace,*
Had filled with wyn his grete botels three,

C. 876 (*Pard. T.*).

Skeat, in his Glossary, gives 'ill' as the meaning of *sory* in this passage; Corson (*Selections from Chaucer's Canterbury Tales*), 'ill, bad.' [=ill grace?]

3. *'... O nyce proude cherl, I shrewe his face!*
Lo, sires,' quod the lord, with harde grace,
Who ever herde of swich a thing er now?

D. 2227 (*Somn. T.*).

Skeat's Glossary: 'displeasure, disgust.' The

same punctuation in Pollard's, Morris's, Bell's, and probably other editions which we are unable to consult here.

4. *This chanoun took his cole, with harde grace,*
G. 1189 (*Chan. Yem. T.*).

Skeat, in his separate edition of *The Tale of the Man of Lawe*, etc., renders *harde grace* by 'hardihood of demeanour, boldness,' but in his 'Oxford Chaucer' corrects it to 'ill luck (that is, a curse upon him).'

5. *This Eolus, with harde grace,*
Heid the windes in distresse, Fame, 1586.

Skeat: 'severity.' von Düring: 'höchst verdrüsslich.'

The first point to be noted in glancing over this list is, that *sory grace* and *harde grace* are used without appreciable difference. In fact, a various reading of the first passage is *harde*; one of the fourth passage, *sory*.¹ As *grace* is found in the sense of 'chance, luck,' and *faire grace* in that of 'good luck,' so *sory (harde) grace* denotes 'bad luck.' Cf. *so fair a grace*, C. 783; also *graceless* ('unfortunate'), G. 1078, *For which he hadde at Thebes sory grace*, D. 746 (Skeat's translation 'disfavour' is at any rate ambiguous); *ful of torment and of harde grace*, Parl. 65, etc. The use of *harde* in this phrase suggests the colloquial 'hard luck'; *sory* may remind us of 'a sorry plight,' 'a sorry spectacle.' Of interest is *in sory houre*, *R. of Rose* 1639, = *de fort hore* of the original.

Harde (sory) grace naturally appears in imprecations: *god yeve it harde grace*, G. 665. *Go, blow this folk a sory grace*, *Fame* 1790 shows a similar use, at least. (Cf. *god yeve him goode grace*, in the late Middle English *Tale of Gamelyn*, l. 268.)

Now the phrases *with sory grace*, *with harde grace*, to be taken parenthetically, serve exactly the same purpose; they may be translated by 'bad luck upon him, etc.' On the function of *with*, see Eikenkel's *Streifzüge durch die mittelenenglische Syntax*, p. 224, where the better known *with meschaunce* is cited. It is significant that another variant of the first passage mentioned above is *with meschaunce*, and that in our fourth quotation *I schrewe his faas* is found as a various reading.

¹ As the Chaucer Society texts are out of reach, we have to rely on Pollard's edition of the *Canterbury Tales*.

In the third instance (D. 2227 ff.), the quotation mark has, accordingly, to be placed before *with harde grace*. It is evident that the lord is not 'displeased' or 'disgusted' at all; he enjoys the joke perpetrated on the friar immensely; and the strong language he uses certainly proves nothing to the contrary. The passage had been well explained by Tyrwhitt long ago.

Quite parallel are the expressions *with meschaunce*, *with sorwe*, *with yvel preef*.

Thus we find

- Is that a cook of Londoun, with meschaunce?* H. 11;
Thus endeth olde Donegild with meschaunce, B. 896;

D. 2215; H. 193; D. 1334 (*with mischaunce and with misaventure*); *Troil.* i, 117 (*lat your fadres treson goon/ Forth with mischaunce*—syntactically interesting), by the side of

god yeve him meschaunce, B. 4623.

Further

- But tel me this, why hydestow, with sorwe . . .*, D. 308;
That took his counseil of his wyf, with sorwe, B. 4443;
And bad him go with sorwe and with meschaunce, A. 4412;
by the side of

god yeve me sorwe, D. 151.

Also

- Thou comest hoom as dronken as a mous,*
And prechest on thy bench, with yvel preef, D. 246.

(See Tyrwhitt's Glossary; also Schaible, *Deutsche Stich- und Hieb-Worte*, p. 55). Skeat translates *preef* by 'proof, assertion'; in Bell's Chaucer *ewil preef* is rendered by 'a defective proof'; Pollard, as usual, says nothing. The context does not seem to justify the meaning of 'proof,' as these lines are to be interpreted in connection with those immediately following. But *with yvel preef* in the sense of *with meschaunce* fits admirably. We notice *yvel preef* in the sense required, in *The Babees Book*, etc., 39, 63:

- Have þou not to manye wordis; to swere be þou not leefse,*
For alle such maners comen to an yvel preef.

Likewise, *good preef* = 'good fortune'—though Skeat explains *preef* simply as 'test, proof'—in

- For your good wil, sir, have ye right good preef*, G. 1379.

That in *all* the instances referred to we have to do with cases of malediction, would appear still more clearly from a comparison with similar phrases. They can easily be culled from Chaucer's large repertory of cursing formulas.

FREDERICK KLAEBER.

University of Minnesota.